



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2013

No. 142

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 11, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:
Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Lord, You know there are many Americans who look to the people's House as uncertainty about the future of the economy and their livelihoods hang in the balance. Petty partisanship and ever-politicizing rhetoric should have no place at all when men and women of goodwill come together to serve the common good.

We ask again that You bless the Members of the people's House with the understanding that it is their work to develop the strategies and plans to assuage the fears of their fellow countrymen and -women.

We ask again that You impel those who possess power here in the Capitol to be mindful of those whom they represent who possess little or no power and whose lives are made all the more difficult by a failure to work out serious differences.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WITTMAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

LET'S GOVERN RESPONSIBLY

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, in July, I stood at this same podium arguing it shouldn't take a government shutdown threat each year to force Congress to do its job. I voted against Congress adjourning for the month of August, insisting that Congress remain to complete critical business.

The work of the people remains unfinished. Today is day 11 of the government shutdown. Thousands of workers stay home, without a paycheck, and yet Congress has not done its job.

This shutdown has failed to will Congress and the administration to the finish line, and we have seen a cycle of crisis management rather than responsible governing.

Mr. Speaker, Washington is broken. This is not governing. This is not what our Founding Fathers intended.

I urge Congress and the leadership in Washington to return to regular order of business. Instead of governing by crisis, let's responsibly govern, by getting the people's business completed on time.

END THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, as we slug through the second week of the government shutdown, American families and small businesses are hurting. Every day of the last 10 days I have been contacted by constituents who cannot operate their stores, pay tribute to their loved ones at a Federal memorial, or secure a small business loan.

These unnecessary hardships damage our economy, and could have been

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6495

avoided if House Republicans were not obsessed with taking away health care benefits from the public we serve.

Government has the duty to keep its doors open, provide vital services, and pay its bills. These items should not be considered a Democratic Party wish list. They are basic functions of government and should not be used as an opportunity to secure political points or hold America's economy hostage.

It is well past time to vote to end the government shutdown, pay our bills, get the Nation back to work, and grow our economy.

A PICTURE IS WORTH A THOUSAND WORDS

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a picture is worth a thousand words, and I felt like it was appropriate today because so many of our colleagues say, Why do we want to discuss ObamaCare when we talk about the budget or talk about the continuing resolution?

And here is the reason why. It is a program that is too expensive to afford.

Take a look at this graph. We all know that, supposedly, when ObamaCare started out—by the way, as an insurance access program for the nearly 40 million that didn't have insurance—it was to be under \$1 trillion, exactly \$863 billion.

So now we look at what has happened to the growth of this program. CBO shows us, looking at this, when you address \$1.4 trillion, 1.7, we are now at \$2.6 trillion in costs over a 10-year period of time.

So to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I say, this is why we have to put this program on the table and discuss it. It is now a nationalization of 17 percent of our Nation's economy and has gone from under \$1 trillion to \$2.6 trillion. Let's get the spending under control.

THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the House Republicans continue to shut down our Federal Government, I rise to draw attention to the impact it is having on our labor markets and job creation in this country.

The House Republican shutdown has prevented even the Bureau of Labor Statistics from releasing the September jobs report, and the Bureau is down to just three employees from its usual number, while the Republican shutdown is, in effect, making it impossible to compile the data for a jobs report for our country.

All we know is that our labor market, the number of people applying for unemployment benefits, increased

somewhere between 66,000 and 300,000 people. We don't know what the unemployment rate actually is because we don't know how many people are looking for work, and we can't find the data. So we don't know what actually happened completely in September and this month.

This is creating needless uncertainty in our markets and makes it harder for businesses to know what is actually happening in our economy.

Before the House Republicans shut down the government, what we did know about our labor market was we still had 11 million people looking for work following the deepest recession since the Great Depression.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Republicans to bring the clean continuing resolution to the floor that has their budget number in it, and let's reopen the government.

IT IS TIME FOR DEBT SOLUTIONS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is time for solutions. We're 11 days into a Federal Government shutdown and days away from exhausting government's \$16.7 trillion credit limit. Both parties need to be committed to opening government and getting our debt under control.

House Republicans want to reopen the government, pay our bills, and defend America's credit rating. So let's keep talking and work to build common ground.

It doesn't matter if you are a Republican or a Democrat. Each side can see the mathematical writing on the wall. In 10 years, discretionary spending will grow 17 percent. Meanwhile, mandatory spending on our debt drivers will grow 79 percent.

Let's agree to start there. Let's reopen government, and let's reform what's driving our debt. Let's talk about making our Tax Code fairer and more competitive. Let's do the responsible thing to make sure we don't find ourselves in this situation year after year.

REPUBLICANS DON'T WANT TO REOPEN THE GOVERNMENT

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans don't want to reopen the government. If they did, all they have to do is bring up the Senate clean resolution and pass it here on the floor today. It'll go back to the Senate—I don't even know if it has to go back to the Senate—and the President has already agreed to sign it.

They are keeping the government closed as hostage because they want to negotiate—I don't even know what anymore. Initially, it was because they wanted to repeal or defund the Afford-

able Care Act. I'm not sure it is even that anymore.

I think sometimes they just want to keep the government closed to show that they can. Clearly, the budget numbers are there. We have agreed to their budget numbers, so that is not the issue.

So, Speaker BOEHNER, please bring up a clean resolution today. The impact on the economy is getting to be more and more devastating every day. As my colleagues have mentioned, more and more jobs are being lost.

Instead of losing jobs, Speaker BOEHNER, we should be here trying to create jobs and use the government to work with the private sector to create jobs and grow the economy.

Don't continue to keep this government shut down. It is 2 weeks now, and the longer it goes on, the more it is going to have an impact on the economy and make it more difficult to create jobs. We will continue to lose jobs.

Bring up the clean resolution, Mr. Speaker.

LET'S GET OUR SPENDING AND DEBT UNDER CONTROL

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it has been a while. I know the American people are frustrated with the shutdown, and a week from now, the country will default if action is not taken.

How we got into this situation is not that complicated. You can only continue to spend so much of the public's money, and then you run out of the public's money.

After years, 4 years of unchecked spending, when the Democrats controlled the House, the Senate and the White House, it has caught up with us. We put the brakes on 2 years ago, and this is a difficult way to put the brakes on now.

No one likes it. The American people don't like it. But we have got to get our spending and we have got to get our debt under control. You continue to spend, you incur debt.

Next week we'll go from \$17 trillion to probably a request for another \$1 trillion. That's not sustainable. We must work together to resolve this in the long-term interest and national economic and financial security of our Nation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled joint resolution was signed by the Speaker on Thursday, October 10, 2013:

H.J. Res. 91, making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION,
2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 76

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) of the National Nuclear Security Administration that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution or in the Pay Our Military Act of September 30, 2013, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the following headings:

- (1) "Weapons Activities".
- (2) "Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation".
- (3) "Naval Reactors".
- (4) "Office of the Administrator".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable

appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Nuclear Weapon Security & Non-Proliferation Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "National Nuclear Security Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Joint Resolution 76, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present critical legislation that will ensure our Nation's nuclear security, the Nuclear Weapons Security and Nonproliferation Act, the joint resolution just mentioned.

This legislation continues funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration at the current level provided in fiscal year 2013 until December 15, or until full-year appropriations have been signed into law. There are no new anomalies and there is no special treatment, but continuing these activities without interruption is vital to our national defense.

The National Nuclear Security Administration is responsible for maintaining our nuclear deterrent, securing vulnerable nuclear materials around the world to keep them out of the hands of terrorists, and supporting our Navy's nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers.

Funds will be used to keep the doors open so our scientists and engineers can keep our nuclear arsenal at the

ready and our nuclear fleet operating efficiently.

□ 0915

These vital programs keep our country safe and secure and require well-trained, dedicated personnel.

So far, these high-priority national security missions have been sustained during this shutdown by operating off prior-year funding. While most of the Department of Energy's science and energy laboratories have enough carry-over funding to operate through November, the national security laboratories and stockpile production sites of the NNSA are not in that same position.

This week, the NNSA sites began notifying workers that they would be shutting down as early as October 17 to preserve remaining funds for essential functions like protecting nuclear materials. By the end of the month, 90 percent of the personnel at our nuclear weapons sites may be laid off, halting work to keep our nuclear weapons reliable. Once laid off, some of these vital workers may never return.

Suspending an ongoing nuclear production operation is no simple task. That interruption will lead to higher costs and only make it more difficult to maintain an aging stockpile. We must act now to prevent disruption of these important nuclear security activities.

We must also sustain the critical work the NNSA's nonproliferation experts perform overseas. Despite hopeful press reports, Iran has not turned off its centrifuges; North Korea may have restarted its reactors to make more plutonium; and the Russian and Chinese Governments continue to build nuclear-armed ballistic submarines.

The technical expertise provided by our nuclear security experts is essential to our Nation's ability to monitor and respond to international developments such as these. We simply cannot afford to lose this oversight of nuclear weapons and their potential for proliferation.

Finally, our nuclear deterrent relies on the mission of our submarines, the very capable assets of which are maintained by the Naval Reactors Program at the Department of Energy. We must ensure they have adequate support to perform their mission across the globe.

Colleagues, I do recognize that this bill will not solve the larger funding problem. We must enact full-year annual appropriations to meet today's requirements, as voted on earlier this year, and not rely on continuing resolutions to keep the government open.

In this regard, my thanks to Ranking Member KAPTUR for her leadership and support of our annual appropriations process. Until we get back to regular order, this bill will provide critical funding to our Nation's security, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleague, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN, for his comments though, obviously, I have serious reservations about this bill because our country has been the world's shining example in how a democratic Republic can actually work efficiently, successfully, and democratically. Yet, today, we continue with the shenanigans from a minority of the majority, wasting God's good time.

For my colleagues who are listening, and for the country, let me say this bill should be coming to the floor at a level of \$31 billion to meet the national security, energy, and water needs of this country. The measure before us today contains \$10.6 billion and only deals with the nuclear security portion of the legislation. That is simply not sufficient for this great country.

We cannot continue to be governed by staggering from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis, and the folly—some would say madness—of what is going on here must be stopped. It is creating great uncertainty inside this economy, and it is harming us globally with our trading partners and with countries who simply can't understand what is happening here.

Over the course of the last several weeks, my Republican colleagues have loudly called for compromise. They have said, Negotiate to reopen the government, but, all the while, changing their demands daily and moving the goalpost. They moved it up the field, down the field, off the field. We start the day and never know exactly where we are.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Members of this House have agreed to a total spending level that is the Republican level of \$986 billion for all of our bills. That is not a number I personally agree with. It will not meet our Nation's needs, but it is a compromise offered in good faith to move our country forward.

My advice to all those who are listening is to bring that clean continuing resolution with the Republican budget number in it to the floor. Let's reopen the government, and we can deal with our tangential issues that have nothing to do with operating the Government of the United States.

Our economy is still in the process of recovering from a horrible Great Recession. We have still not come back to the preemployment levels in this country that were so deeply harmed by the Wall Street-induced housing crisis. Shouldn't we be debating ways to spur economic growth, not continuing to debate a shutdown that is slowing economic growth?

Under the Obama administration, we have had 42 consecutive months of economic growth. We are crawling out of a mammoth hole. The American people view the disarray here as very, very destabilizing to their own security because they are worried about their futures, and what is going on here adds to their anxiety.

For the entire country, the Republican shutdown is already having real

and negative consequences. Over 800,000 workers have been furloughed. They are having to borrow on their credit cards because they don't know how they are going to make their mortgage payment. They have to put their kids in school. They have to buy groceries.

From coast-to-coast, we know—although we don't have people in place at the Department of Labor right now—that over 66,000—up to 300,000—more unemployment claims have now been filed in the country because of what is going on due to these 800,000 more people that have gotten some form of a pink slip.

For the entire country, this shut-down is wrong and unnecessary. The impacts will be felt across this economy—and already are—in the services that the American taxpayers pay for and that the Federal Government has, up to now, provided. As we continue to shortchange critical energy and infrastructure investments so vital to a strong economy, we will witness, as dusk follows dawn, the slowing of economic growth and the hindering of American competitiveness.

Let me turn to what is not funded by the piecemeal approach that this bill represents. Our bill should be coming to the floor with all the parts of the Department of Energy and Army Corps of Engineers and National Nuclear Security Administration in it. The bill should be coming to us at a level of \$31 billion. The bill is but one-third of that. At a level of \$10.6 billion, it is two-thirds underfunded.

Let me turn to what is not funded in the bill that is before us.

First of all, the Corps of Engineers, one of the most important instrumentalities in our government to create jobs, is not even in this cynical bill. Communities across our country will continue to feel the consequences of this decreased investment. We should be doing more to prevent flooding, to build infrastructure, to create jobs, not less.

For those of you who have been yelling from the rooftops about the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, this bill does nothing—zero—for your ports and harbors.

This bill does not fund any of the energy technology accounts so critical to our Nation becoming energy independent again. As our foreign competitors double down to develop 21st century technology—look at the Chinese stealing our solar technology—and undermine our markets through illegal dumping and intellectual property poaching, our choice in this bill: do nothing.

So, renewable energy will receive cost competitiveness by whom? Which countries will succeed? Who will develop it and own that technology? According to this, we are ceding the turf to them, ceding the field to them.

If you look at U.S. trade accounts, you don't have to be a mathematical genius. What is the number one category of trade deficit of this country?

Imported energy. And what is the number two category of trade deficit? Automotive and automotive parts. It is all connected. If America doesn't heal those accounts, we become weaker as a country; we have fewer jobs here at home, less wealth creation here at home.

And this particular bill is absent any forward thinking about new energy systems for our country. The United States has spent \$2.3 trillion importing petroleum just since 2003.

I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say we have a \$17 trillion debt that we have to pay off. We sure do. And where do you think it has come from? It has come from the lack of wealth creation inside this country for a quarter of a century, starting with imported energy.

This represents thousands and thousands and millions of jobs across this country lost and dollars out of the pockets of working-class Americans who see their purchases of fuel transferred to build giant hotels in Dubai, supporting universities in Dubai, all across the Middle East, while we see companies close, communities shut down, Detroit go bankrupt; and all these problems because we are not energy independent and we are not transportation independent.

These are dollars spent not in much-needed job creation but siphoned off overseas, assisting our competitors in developing their economies and their energy futures, not our own.

Is it any wonder that America has a debt? It is rooted in very major holes inside this economy. You could start with two wars. What did those cost us? Probably \$4 trillion to \$6 trillion—unpaid for. There wasn't any war tax imposed when President Bush took us to war.

I remember Donald Rumsfeld saying, Well, you have got to go to war with the military you have. Well, they borrowed to do that, and now this President has begun to keep his promise to the American people. We are out of Iraq and we are moving out of Afghanistan, as we try to hold those sad places together with our allies.

The housing crisis of 2008, it is anybody's guess what that cost us, but we know it hollowed out money creation in this country. We have the largest transfer of wealth and loss of equity in modern history. Do you think you crawl out of that in a month or 2 months? It takes years. We have had 42 months of steady job creation.

The trade deficit, America hasn't had a balanced trade account in three decades. Since 1975, the cumulative trade deficit of this country was \$8.4 trillion. There was more petroleum coming in here from abroad than American energy exports out, more cars and auto parts in here from abroad than cars and auto parts out, and more electronics components coming in here than American electronics exports out.

So if you add up \$8.4 trillion of trade deficit, \$6 trillion of war expenditures,

if you take the cost of the meltdown on Wall Street—only God knows how many trillions that cost us—is it any wonder that the United States has a budget deficit and debt and the Federal Government is trying to hold the Republic together and our 50 States from coast-to-coast? It is pretty clear to me what is going on here.

So we look at this bill. Our Republic will not compete in the 21st century and beyond if we further reduce investments in energy and cede our energy future to other countries. The bill before us today does nothing about that. In fact, in one of the most important related sectors to us, manufacturing, this bill does nothing in manufacturing.

One of the reasons we don't have as much economic muscle in this country is because every community you go to, what do you see? Shuttered factories. Every product you pick up, what does it say? "Made in China." Anytime I go to the store and find anything made in America, I buy it in hopes that it will help somebody somewhere along the way.

This bill does nothing for manufacturing. We have lost 15 percent of our manufacturing jobs. And it isn't just because of technology; it is because they have been shipped out, outsourced, made in China, not made in the USA, made in countries some of my constituents don't even know where they are, and these goods come in here. And every time American jobs get displaced in the manufacturing sector, 8.8 million manufacturing jobs disappear.

□ 0930

Manufacturing is one of the most important drivers in our economy, and yet we have a huge trade deficit in manufacturing. There is little merit in using Federal dollars to foster technological advances or breakthroughs for products that are not ultimately manufactured domestically in our country. This bill usually provides a means for us to do more to reverse the trend of domestic firms shifting manufacturing overseas because, to put it simply, domestic manufacturing drives domestic innovation, and that drives wealth creation and job creation in our country. This bill does nothing in the advanced manufacturing sector—off the table.

How sad. How sad for those people across our country who know the value added from manufacturing.

This bill does nothing for science or advanced science and energy. Return on investments from our publicly funded research and development ranges from 20 to 67 percent. What a bang for the buck. With this rate of return, we should be passing a bill that invests in science and high sciences, but that is not happening inside this bill. In fact, across this country, at all of our major labs, the workers are furloughed or have the threat of being furloughed hanging over them—at Livermore, at Sandia, at Argonne. The brain power of

this country is being put on the shelf while they watch this charade here inside this Chamber.

This bill does nothing to address the funding for the Office of Environmental Management, whose mission is to complete the safe cleanup of what they call an "environmental legacy" and that I call a "nuclear mess," brought about by five decades of nuclear weapons development and government-sponsored nuclear energy research.

So what do we do to clean up nuclear mess around our country in this bill? Zero. We do nothing.

What about our promises to the people who live near those communities? What about those who sacrifice so much for America's nuclear superiority? We shut the door. So long. Nothing. There is nothing in this bill.

This energy and water bill is one of the most critical investments we can make in this country. It should promote job creation. It should ensure national security. It should protect and promote our vital infrastructure and advance American competitiveness through energy independence and through strengthening manufacturing and scientific capability right here at home, right here in the good old USA. Unfortunately, a minority of the majority of Republicans is choosing to ignore all of these critical investments in order to execute a blatantly political stunt that is already harming our country, upsetting our people, and tamping down on job growth.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is stronger when we come together. We as a people can solve the serious challenges facing our country; yet here we find ourselves today again, wasting time on a lopsided bill which only extends the GOP-driven shutdown. We should be spending our time passing a clean continuing resolution, not holding the entire country hostage to a reckless political stunt that some must get great pleasure out of but that is such a sadistic approach to the governing of this country. We ought to work together toward a long-term solution, not continue to award a faction of one party which has no interest in governing this country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Nuclear Weapon Security and Non-Proliferation Act.

Yes, it is a narrow scope, but it is a terribly important piece of the government. Like the bill we passed yesterday, this legislation addresses matters of critical importance to our national security. The National Nuclear Security Administration maintains our nuclear deterrents here at home, but it

also helps to ensure that nuclear weapons and materials don't fall into the wrong hands—those of terrorists and other enemies of our Nation.

H.J. Res. 76 provides funding for the NNSA to continue this vital work—to keep our nuclear arsenal at the ready and our Navy ships powered—and, ultimately, to keep this country safe and secure and protected.

This is particularly important at a time when we face multiple threats from unpredictable nations and groups. When our government shut down, it did not also shut down nuclear power reactors, research and testing in Iraq, Iran, or North Korea. Funding is provided at the current annual rate of \$10.59 billion to sustain the national labs, to continue the work of skilled workers and scientists, to conduct ongoing non-proliferation intelligence operations, and to maintain the safety and readiness of our nuclear stockpile.

As with the prior 14 mini-CRs this House has passed in the last week, this language is essentially identical to what was included in my initial short-term continuing resolution. So this is a clean bill, Mr. Speaker, adhering to the Senate's demands in that regard. Also, as with the prior bills, this funding will last until December 15 or until full-year appropriations are enacted. It is my hope that the latter is what happens.

Our Nation deserves the certainty of an adequately funded government with appropriations bills that reflect current needs but also current fiscal restraints. To achieve this, we must come together with our Senate counterparts and have a meaningful discussion that establishes a single, common, top-line number for discretionary spending that Members of both parties and both Houses of Congress can work toward.

The ongoing standoffs are not productive. They aren't getting us any closer to reopening the government. While it is not the ideal path forward at this time, passing this funding bill does get us a step closer to ending the shutdown, which I know is the goal of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

So far, this House has voted on a bipartisan basis to reopen critical government functions, including the support for those who serve the country in the Department of Defense. Our nuclear security efforts are equally important to our defense and should have ongoing funding to keep the country safe and sound. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to the time remaining on this side, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 12 minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from New York, Congresswoman NITA LOWEY, our esteemed ranking member.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican shutdown.

Of course we support funding for nuclear weapon security and nonproliferation activities, but this bill does nothing to address a number of other critical energy and water priorities, including the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Energy's Office of Science, ARPA-E, and the Office of Environmental Management, which is responsible for cleaning up five decades' worth of weapons development and nuclear energy research.

Even if House Republicans' irresponsible, piecemeal bills were enacted, at the rate they are going, it would take until after Christmas before the government would be fully up and running.

We could end this shutdown today if Republican leadership would just allow a vote. The claim that Democrats won't negotiate is a farce, my friends. Throughout the year, we have pleaded with Republicans to sit down and negotiate a broader budget agreement; and dozens of times Republicans have refused. Now, after wasting the first 10 months of the year and after shutting down the government as they steer the country towards economic catastrophe, they claim they want to negotiate. Democrats and the President have already agreed to the Republicans' funding level. If only Republicans would allow a vote, we could have the government reopened tonight.

Vote "no" on this bill, and let's vote to immediately end the Republican shutdown.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

To all of my colleagues in this great United States House of Representatives, I want to ask each and every one of you to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent the Third District of Tennessee. In the Third District of Tennessee is a very special city. It's called Oak Ridge. At one point in time, it was called the Secret City. That's where we had the Manhattan Project and brought World War II to a close because of the efforts of the men and women who worked there and who succeeded there. We won the Cold War there.

Today, this bill does one very specific thing: it honors the almost 5,000 workers who work every day at the Y-12 National Security Complex for our nuclear deterrent.

Let me be clear: this is not a matter of partisan politics; this is a matter of national security. So I stand here, putting a very human face on this for the workers who work hard every day, who have toiled for years. They deserve better, and this bill does that.

Again, let me be clear: Y-12 is going through an orderly shutdown. We cannot allow this to happen, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Ameri-

cans. The Nation's security is at risk. This bill keeps Y-12 open, and this is exactly what we need to do.

Let's put aside the partisan rhetoric, and let's honor the hardworking men and women of Y-12. Let's keep them working, and let's keep the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth safe and secure.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York, Mr. HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, this is day 11 of the reckless Republican shutdown of the United States Government, and you have still failed to provide a way out of the mess that you have created.

The communities that I represent in Brooklyn and Queens are still struggling from the devastation of Superstorm Sandy; yet this bill fails to fund the Army Corps of Engineers.

This was a wholesale government shutdown, and all that is offered is a piecemeal reopening. You have burned down the entire house, but offer only to rebuild the kitchen. That is a shameful dereliction of duty and a woefully inadequate remedy. This shutdown is hurting the American people. It is undemocratic, unconscionable, unnecessary, unreasonable, and unjust.

It is time to get back to doing the business of the American people. Let's reopen the entire government. Vote "no" on this piecemeal approach.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership and for bringing this measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the bill the gentleman brought to the floor on Wednesday, just the day before yesterday, passed the House, passed the Senate, and it was signed into law by the President last night. So the argument that you can't fund any of the government unless you fund all of the government is, obviously, not true. Every single Member of the House voted for the bill that the gentleman from New Jersey brought to the floor that was dealing with military death benefits.

We have set priorities. We have said the military has to be paid, and this bill also sets priorities because the nuclear deterrent is absolutely central to our national security just as the military is.

For 60 years, the centerpiece of our country's security has been the nuclear deterrent that has helped keep us secure. These are aging weapons, however, and so that means there are maintenance issues, there are safety issues, there are reliability issues, which a very highly skilled, dedicated workforce must address every single day.

So that's what this bill does. This allows that work to continue, as well as

the very important work in dealing with nonproliferation, as well as keeping our nuclear-powered ships operating. All of those things central to our country's security are empowered by this bill.

□ 0945

Mr. Speaker, it is the easiest excuse any of us can use to oppose a bill because of what it does not do.

What we ought to do is look at what a bill does do. What this bill does do is keep the central part of our country's security operating even as we sort out our other budget woes.

I think it deserves the support of all Members of the House, and I encourage them to vote for it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the esteemed gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman BEN RAY LUJÁN.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, funding for the NNSA is critically important to my State of New Mexico, for we are home to both Los Alamos and Sandia National Labs. However, this bill denies these national security labs the funding they need as it locks in the deep cuts of sequester for 2 more months.

There is not a Member of this body—Democrat or Republican—that says they like the sequester, Mr. Speaker, but my Republican colleagues refuse to lift it. They say they want to keep the government open, but they place conditions on it.

This piecemeal approach in this bill to the Department of Energy and to the NNSA is picking winners and losers with employees that are going to be furloughed. This is a shame, and it is a sham—this Republican charade that is going to go home to my State of New Mexico and direct the Directors of the labs to tell employees who is going to go home without a paycheck and who will not—because there is still not assurance that the Secretary of Energy, through the Department of Energy, will make these employees whole through allowable costs that will be accepted. Enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, this is a shame. Let's do the right thing and open the government.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), also a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), for bringing this important measure to the floor.

Since the start of this partial shutdown 11 days ago, the House has focused on one of our core constitutional functions: funding key portions of the Federal Government.

We have come together in a bipartisan way several times over the past few days to pay our troops, provide benefits for the families of fallen soldiers, reopen the NIH, provide money

for disaster relief efforts, and fund other crucial governmental departments and operations.

These are the types of tough spending choices the American people, and people in my district, demand we make. When you are nearly \$17 trillion in debt, you have to prioritize, just like any business or family does when funds are tight.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we turn our focus to a critical issue of national security and public safety. That is ensuring that the National Nuclear Security Administration has the funding it needs to secure our nuclear stockpile and materials.

Recent reports indicate that the Department of Energy may begin furloughing employees and contractors at the eight NNSA sites around the country starting October 21. Sites such as the Nevada National Security Site, which is home to approximately 2,500 employees and contractors, will reduce staffing to levels sufficient to maintain "minimally safe operations." This situation presents a threat to national security, public safety, and our economy.

The Nevada National Security Site is charged with supporting our national stockpile. Additionally, the Security Site oversees the administration of training for first responders in the prevention of, protection from, and response to possible terrorist use of radiological or nuclear material. With critical functions such as these, "minimally safe operations" is simply not an option.

The same is true at NNSA sites around the country. The men and women who work at these sites not only have critical duties, but they are also critical to our local economies.

In fact, contractors at NNSA sites may reduce their workforce by as much as 80 to 90 percent. Such attrition would take a great deal of money out of the economy at a time when States like mine, with an unemployment rate of 9.5 percent, can ill-afford to lose jobs.

H.J. Res. 76 maintains our national security and prevents harm to our economy.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked about our being the "greatest Nation in the world," but Republicans are running it like a banana republic. People who ran out of this Chamber gleeful that the government was going to shut down have suddenly discovered that there is 20 percent of the government that they want to operate.

There is a simple way to resolve this impasse. If you want to negotiate truly, appoint the conferees to the Budget Committee. The Republicans

have refused to do that for 6 months. If you want to control spending, bring your own appropriations bills to the floor and see if your people have the fortitude to slash government spending further.

Remember, they stopped operation on the Transportation-HUD bill 2 months ago. It can be brought up today. But they refuse to do so because their spending levels are so unrealistic their own Members won't vote for them. They would rather deal in the abstract. They would rather hold America hostage. It is shameful. It is unnecessary.

Bring a continuing resolution to the floor and put the government back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Congressman RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, for yielding. I am very grateful for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, funding our national security interests within the Department of Energy must be a priority in order to protect every American family. Today, the House will pass an important measure that will fund the National Nuclear Security Administration. The NNSA will provide necessary resources that are critical and allow our country to continue operations for dozens of vital national security missions.

I am fortunate to represent the Department of Energy Savannah River Site in Aiken and Barnwell Counties, South Carolina. I especially appreciate its personnel, as the only Member of Congress who has actually worked at the site.

The passage of this bill is essential, as it will provide our dedicated workers who are handling these operations the security they need to complete their vital missions. Our Nation is a much safer place because of ongoing tritium operations and the mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility currently under construction at SRS. These missions are essential to our Nation's national security, as they allow us to service our nuclear stockpile and honor international nuclear obligations of non-proliferation.

Additionally, the Savannah River Site, which established victory in the Cold War, has thousands of committed employees working on Department of Energy environmental management projects. These professionals also provide crucial services to our country through their nuclear nonproliferation and environmental cleanup efforts.

Although I am encouraged by today's legislation, I remain hopeful that Congress can work together to provide necessary funding for these projects as well.

I appreciate Chairman HAL ROGERS for bringing this bill to the floor today and urge all of my colleagues of both parties to vote in support of this legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his dedication and commitment to the important issue of our strategic assets.

When we look at the NNSA, they have had for a number of years difficulty in getting support from this administration for the important efforts of modernizing our nuclear weapons infrastructure and ensuring the strategic assets that are so essential to our Nation's security.

This issue also is one that represents, I think, a great analogy to the difficulty that we are having in resolving this conflict. We have the President of the United States, who openly states that he will have negotiations with Russia on our strategic assets, on our nuclear weapons. He will even have secret negotiations—as we saw in his open mic incident—with his secret deal with the Russians concerning our missile defense systems; yet, the President openly says he will not negotiate with the legislature. He will negotiate with Syria, he will negotiate with Iran, but he won't negotiate with the legislature.

Also, this issue illustrates some of the difficulties that we have in this House itself. We are putting on House bills that should have 100 percent unanimous support. Yet when these bills come to the House, these bills predominantly have been divided on a partisan basis because people want to say, Well, it doesn't fund everything.

Everyone knows when you have a disagreement, you start first upon the things you agree. The bills that have been coming forth on this House floor should be the things that we agree on, but partisan politics continues to divide us where, instead of the House coming together on all of these bills and saying, yes, these are the things that we agree on, and we will put aside the things we disagree on for later, we have difficulty in getting even the important things done, and this is an important one.

I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his commitment to ensure the safety of our nuclear deterrent, the workers, and the important work that is being done at the NNSA.

This is a discussion, though, that needs to go beyond just this stopgap bill and even the issue of a CR. This administration has continually cut the resources for our nuclear deterrent in ways which jeopardize the future of our strategic assets. We need to make certain that this conversation continues.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Ms. KAPTUR, do you have any further speakers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio's time has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would thank the chairman for that courtesy and just say that I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this particular piecemeal continuing resolution. Hopefully, others will come to their senses and we will be able to vote for a clean continuing resolution, which I think the majority of members of our subcommittee would appreciate, so we can reopen the government and deal with all of the responsibilities that we have under this particular bill and meet our responsibilities to energy and water across this country.

I thank the gentleman for his courtesy, and I hope to reciprocate sometime.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to work with Ms. KAPTUR.

In closing, Robert Spalding wrote in *The Washington Post* recently an article called "Nuclear Weapons are Instruments of Peace." In his close, he wrote:

The sensible path to peace starts with the realization that peace can be secured only through strength. Nuclear weapons represent that strength. We must embrace it through funding and rhetoric.

Indeed we do. Nothing is more important than the reliability of our nuclear weapon stockpile, as is obviously our responsibility to the world to prevent nuclear proliferation, and one of the ways that we protect America and provide for a strong national defense is to have a strong naval reactor program so that our aircraft carriers and subs can truly do the work of freedom.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 76 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1025

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 76 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kelly of Illinois moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 76 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my amendment is a long-overdue commonsense improvement that has bipartisan support in this House and has the majority of support of the American people. If my amendment passes, it will end this costly and irresponsible government shutdown and reopen the entire Federal Government so that we may once again appropriately serve the American people.

As written, the bill before us offers the men, women, and children we represent little comfort. This piecemeal approach to funding the government is hurting folks in all of our districts. How can we commit to protecting nuclear security but not commit to the security of our Federal Government by completely funding it? How can we protect nuclear weapons but furlough our intelligence personnel who serve on the front lines in defending us from terrorist attacks? Why are we paying hardworking Federal employees, who

want to get back to work, to stay at home and not to do the job our Nation depends on them to do?

As we sit here voting to fund bills bit by bit, our constituents are being dealt the full blow and consequences of this shutdown. They can't afford for this shutdown to drag on as we mull over whether it is more important to get our food inspectors back on the job or for America's veterans to have their benefits claims processed.

The piecemeal approach isn't working. The gimmicks must stop.

As we discussed nuclear weapon security, I was reminded of the movie "War Games." This was the eighties movie with Matthew Broderick as the slacker hacker facing off against a supercomputer that was programmed to go to war when it doesn't even know what it is fighting for.

I will allow a quick second for a "spoiler alert" and summarize: after several failed attempts at starting a global nuclear war, the computer runs through all the possible scenarios—all of which end in stalemates—before it discovers the concept of mutually assured destruction, the very simple concept that the war it was trying to launch was an exercise in futility because it would destroy the U.S. in the process.

"A strange game," the computer says. "The only winning move is not to play." And that is where we find ourselves as a Nation, heading toward a mutually assured destruction at the hands of an ideological few, programmed to go to war when they don't even know the risk of the game they are playing and the consequences of their fight.

We have had a week go by without the lessons resonating that there are no winners in the funding scenarios that have been brought to the floor, and the American people are losing out worst of all.

But this isn't a game. This is reality. This isn't a fictional eighties movie. This is the United States of America in October of 2013.

For the past week, we have pursued a fundamentally inept method for reopening the government. Today we need to pay particular attention to one number, 79. That is how many different appropriations bills the House and Senate will have to pass to fund the full nondefense portion of the Federal Government, given the rate of funding and the bills passed or announced in the House of Representatives so far.

The men, women, and children in my district—in all of our districts—are dealing with the taxing reality of a shut-down government. We can't cherry-pick who to fund and who not to fund bit by bit.

I ask all of you to vote "yes" on this motion because Congress has a duty to offer the security of a functional government to our families, our veterans, and our economy. Vote "yes" on this motion. Vote "yes" to open up all of our government right now.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair most recently ruled on October 10, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and, therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Illinois wish to speak on the point of order?

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized to speak on the point of order.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund a portion of the Federal Government? My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that all of the benefits that the taxpayers have paid for with their hard-earned dollars are available.

Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to open up all of the government instead of just a portion of the government? Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not have a chance to keep the entire Federal Government open today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't keep the entire Federal Government open today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the National Nuclear Security Administration. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair most recently ruled on October 10, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

Therefore, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Petri
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Amodei	Pitts	Pitts
Bachmann	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barletta	Hall	Posey
Barr	Hanna	Price (GA)
Barton	Harper	Radel
Benish	Harris	Reed
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Reichert
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Black	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Holding	Rigell
Boustany	Hudson	Roby
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Issa	Rokita
Bucshon	Jenkins	Rooney
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Camp	Jones	Ross
Campbell	Jordan	Rothfus
Cantor	Joyce	Royce
Capito	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Carter	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	King (NY)	Salmon
Chabot	Kingston	Sanford
Chaffetz	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Coffman	Kline	Schock
Cole	Labrador	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lance	Sessions
Cook	Lankford	Shimkus
Cotton	Latham	Shuster
Cramer	Latta	Simpson
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Culberson	Long	Smith (NE)
Daines	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Denham	Lummis	Southerland
Dent	Marchant	Stewart
DeSantis	Marino	Stivers
DesJarlais	Massie	Stockman
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
Duffy	McCaul	Terry
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Thornberry
Ellmers	McKeon	Tiberi
Farenthold	McKinley	Tipton
Fincher	McMorris	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Upton
Fleischmann	Meadows	Valadao
Fleming	Meehan	Wagner
Flores	Messer	Walberg
Forbes	Mica	Walden
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Fox	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Wenstrup
Gardner	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Noem	Wittman
Gibson	Nugent	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Womack
Gohmert	Nunnelee	Woodall
Goodlatte	Olson	Yoder
Gosar	Palazzo	Yoho
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Granger	Pearce	Young (IN)
Graves (GA)	Perry	

NAYS—195

Andrews	Beatty	Bishop (NY)
Barber	Becerra	Blumenauer
Barrow (GA)	Bera (CA)	Bonamici
Bass	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)

Braley (IA)	Heck (WA)	Payne
Brown (FL)	Himes	Pelosi
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Bustos	Holt	Peters (CA)
Butterfield	Honda	Peters (MI)
Capps	Horsford	Peterson
Capuano	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Cárdenas	Huffman	Pocan
Carney	Israel	Polis
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Jeffries	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Chu	Kaptur	Richmond
Cicilline	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Clarke	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Clay	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kind	T.
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Kuster	Sarbanes
Cooper	Langevin	Schakowsky
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Cuellar	Levin	Schwartz
Cummings	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Loebach	Serrano
DeFazio	Loftgren	Sewell (AL)
DeGette	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
Delaney	Lowey	Sherman
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
DelBene	(NM)	Sires
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Slaughter
Dingell	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Lynch	Speier
Doyle	Maffei	Swalwell (CA)
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Edwards	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Engel	McCollum	Tierney
Enyart	McDermott	Titus
Eshoo	McGovern	Tonko
Esty	McNerney	Tsongas
Farr	Meeks	Van Hollen
Fattah	Meng	Vargas
Foster	Michaud	Veasey
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Vela
Fudge	Moore	Velázquez
Gabbard	Moran	Visclosky
Galleo	Murphy (FL)	Walz
Garamendi	Nadler	Wasserman
Garcia	Napolitano	Schultz
Grayson	Neal	Waters
Green, Al	Negrete McLeod	Watt
Green, Gene	Nolan	Waxman
Grijalva	O'Rourke	Welch
Gutiérrez	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Hahn	Pallone	Yarmuth
Hanabusa	Pascarell	
Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)	

NOT VOTING—10

Coble	Maloney,	Rush
Crenshaw	Carolyn	Whitfield
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Higgins	McIntyre	

□ 1055

Messrs. GARCIA and RICHMOND changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 176, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

AYES—248

Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Amash	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Peters (CA)
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Peters (MI)
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Barber	Grimm	Pittenger
Barletta	Guthrie	Pitts
Barr	Hall	Poe (TX)
Barrow (GA)	Hanna	Pompeo
Barton	Harper	Posey
Benishke	Harris	Price (GA)
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Radel
Bera (CA)	Hastings (WA)	Reed
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Renacci
Black	Holding	Ribble
Blackburn	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Braley (IA)	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Burgess	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Bustos	Jordan	Roskam
Calvert	Joyce	Ross
Camp	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Campbell	King (IA)	Royce
Cantor	King (NY)	Ruiz
Capito	Kingston	Runyan
Carter	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kline	Salmon
Chabot	Labrador	Sanford
Chaffetz	LaMalfa	Scalise
Coffman	Lamborn	Schneider
Cole	Lance	Schock
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Latham	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Lipinski	Sessions
Cotton	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Cramer	Loebach	Shuster
Crawford	Long	Simpson
Culberson	Lucas	Sinema
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Smith (NE)
DeBene	Lynch	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Maloney, Sean	Smith (TX)
Dent	Marchant	Southerland
DeSantis	Marino	Stewart
DesJarlais	Massie	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	Matheson	Stockman
Duffy	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Terry
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers	McHenry	Thornberry
Farenthold	McIntyre	Tiberi
Fincher	McKeon	Tipton
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Turner
Fleischmann	McMorris	Upton
Fleming	Rodgers	Valadao
Flores	Meadows	Wagner
Forbes	Meehan	Walberg
Fortenberry	Messer	Walden
Foster	Mica	Walorski
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Wenstrup
Galleo	Mullin	Westmoreland
Garcia	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gardner	Murphy (FL)	Williams
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gibbs	Noem	Wolf
Gibson	Nugent	Womack
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Woodall
Gohmert	Nunnelee	Yoder
Goodlatte	Olson	Yoho
Gosar	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NOES—176

Andrews	Beatty	Bishop (GA)
Bass	Becerra	Bishop (NY)

Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Payne
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Peterson
Butterfield	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Horsford	Pocan
Capuano	Hoyer	Polis
Cardenas	Huffman	Price (NC)
Carney	Israel	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Cartwright	Jeffries	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Chu	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Clarke	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Linda
Clay	Kennedy	T.
Cleaver	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kind	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Conyers	Kuster	Schrader
Cooper	Langevin	Schwartz
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Cuellar	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sires
DeFazio	Lowe	Slaughter
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
Delaney	(NM)	Speier
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	(NM)	Takano
Dingell	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Carolyn	Tierney
Duckworth	Matsui	Titus
Edwards	McCollum	Tonko
Ellison	McDermott	Tsongas
Engel	McGovern	Van Hollen
Enyart	McNerney	Vargas
Eshoo	Meeks	Veasey
Esty	Meng	Vela
Farr	Michaud	Velázquez
Fattah	Miller, George	Visclosky
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Walz
Fudge	Moran	Wasserman
Gabbard	Nadler	Schultz
Garamendi	Napolitano	Waters
Grayson	Neal	Watt
Green, Al	Negrete McLeod	Waxman
Green, Gene	Nolan	Welch
Grijalva	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
Gutiérrez	Owens	Yarmuth
Hahn	Pallone	
Hanabusa	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—7

Coble	Higgins	Young (FL)
Crenshaw	McCarthy (NY)	
Herrera Beutler	Rush	

□ 1106

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1359

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 378, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 379, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO CROP INSURANCE

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-244) on the resolution (H. Res. 380) relating to consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 11, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 11, 2013 at 10:15 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1276.

That the Senate agreed to with amendments H. Con. Res. 58.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1400

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 378, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 379, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO CROP INSURANCE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 380 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 380

Resolved, That it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order for the chair of the Committee on Agriculture or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 and agree to a conference with the Senate thereon.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Pitts of Pennsylvania or his designee and an opponent.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Ryan of Wisconsin or his designee and an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 380 provides for a motion to go to conference with the Senate on H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, also known as the farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule authorizes House Agriculture Committee Chairman FRANK LUCAS to make a motion to go to conference with the Senate on the farm bill and provides for consideration of two resolutions expressing the sense of the House regarding specific provisions in the farm bill.

Conference committees are a crucial step in resolving policy differences between the House and Senate, and I am encouraged that the House is taking this step to provide certainty for farmers across this country by reauthorizing Federal agriculture policy.

The House proposal is not perfect, but it moves Federal agriculture policy in the right direction; and my hope is that during a conference committee with the Senate, we can find common ground.

Additionally, the rule makes in order the consideration of two resolutions that express the sense of the House on crop insurance and the U.S. sugar program. The first resolution expresses the sense of the House that conferees should agree to limit crop insurance based on average adjusted gross income in excess of \$750,000. This commonsense proposal ensures that crop insurance is appropriately targeted to those who need it most.

The second resolution instructs conferees to advance provisions to repeal the administration of tariff rate quotas and, thus, restore the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to manage supplies of sugar throughout the year to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices. I strongly support this resolution, as it restores free-market principles to the U.S. sugar program.

This rule provides for the business of legislating and resolving differences between our two Chambers to find common ground and move forward in reauthorizing Federal agriculture policy. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, the motion to go to conference, and the motions to instruct provided by this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are finally going to conference on the farm bill. I believe strongly that we need to reauthorize a 5-year bill to provide some clarity and provide some certainty not just for our farmers, but also for the millions of Americans who rely on nutrition assistance to feed themselves and their families.

I need to just say a few words about the process. I do not think I have ever seen a motion to go to conference with two motions to instruct conferees to

the majority party in the House as all part of one rule. This is kind of an odd precedent, Mr. Speaker; but there are a lot of odd things going on around here during these last few days. We see major pieces of legislation, appropriation bills, coming to the Rules Committee that have never even been considered on the floor; and all of a sudden, they are brought before the House under a closed process. But anyway, I think it is pretty clear that regular order has been discarded in this House.

But putting that aside, let me say that I would like to take most of my time here to talk about the issue of hunger in America because this bill is very relevant to that subject.

After a \$20 billion cut to the SNAP program was voted down by the House in June, the Republican leadership sadly decided to double-down on the cruelty with a nearly \$40 billion cut. That bill also narrowly passed, and I want to thank the brave Republicans who stood with us, who listened to their own constituents, and who listened to their consciences and joined with us in voting "no" on that \$40 billion cut.

Supporters of those cuts say it is all about "reform." Well, this is not about reform, Mr. Speaker. It is about trying to destroy a very important part of the social safety net.

I am happy to talk to anyone and everyone about how we can improve SNAP. Where there is waste or there is fraud or there is abuse, we should crack down on it; but the House bill takes a sledgehammer to a program that provides food—food, Mr. Speaker—to some of our most vulnerable neighbors.

The CBO says that the nearly \$40 billion cut would throw 3.8 million low-income people off SNAP in 2014 and millions more in the following years. These are some of America's poorest adults as well as many low-income children, seniors, and families that work for low wages. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, so there is no confusion. People who work or who don't make enough to feed their families would be cut from this program.

Well, if that weren't bad enough, 210,000 children in these families will also lose their free school meals; and 170,000 unemployed veterans will lose their SNAP benefits. Now, we all stand up here and tell our constituents how much we care about our veterans and how much we honor them; but to throw 170,000 of these veterans off this food program because they can't find work, that is unbelievable. That is unbelievable, and it is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to be poor in America. It is not a glamorous life. It is a struggle just to make it through the day. The average SNAP benefit is \$1.50 per meal. Housing costs, transportation costs, child care costs—they all add up.

Fighting hunger used to be a bipartisan issue. Think of people like Bob Dole and Bill Emerson working with George McGovern and Tony Hall.

I am hopeful that once we get to conference, we can resurrect that bipartisan spirit and work together to strengthen our Nation's food assistance programs.

I would also note that we are approaching November 1, a day of reckoning for my Republican colleagues. Automatic cuts to SNAP are already scheduled to take place. If they do not end the Republican shutdown, we are going to see even more terrible, terrible consequences for the hungry in this country. We have already seen some assistance delayed or denied. If this shutdown isn't ended, SNAP, WIC, Meals on Wheels, and the Emergency Food Assistance Program will all be devastated.

I would say to my colleagues, you can't approach the budget in a piecemeal way, and you can't approach the social safety net in this country in a piecemeal way. If you miss a part of that net that makes up the social safety net in this country, then people fall through the cracks; and people are falling through the cracks because of this ridiculous shutdown that my Republican friends have thrust upon this country.

We shouldn't be here talking about a shutdown or about whether we are going to default on our debt come October 17. We should be talking about how we create jobs for people or how we strengthen programs to end hunger in America and how we make life for people in this country better, not worse. And yet here we are, as we are about to go to conference on the farm bill, dealing with this shutdown that is making hunger worse in America.

I would urge my colleagues to, once again, come to the floor with a clean continuing resolution. Bring up the Senate bill, the Senate bill that is at Republican numbers, the budget numbers that my Republican friends said they wanted, the sequester numbers that I think are awful; but let's bring it up and have a clean vote.

I am willing to compromise and cooperate with my Republican colleagues to pass a short-term continuing resolution at their numbers to keep the government going. I think that is the least we could do. And I would urge my colleagues, before the day is out, to bring that kind of resolution to the House floor.

So I urge my colleagues to pass a clean continuing resolution and remove the sword hanging over the heads of the hungry in this country. I would also urge all of my colleagues, as we go to conference, to insist that in that conference we fix this terrible, terrible mistake that this House of Representatives made when they passed a \$40 billion cut in the SNAP program.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

□ 1415

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the rule to consider my resolution to reform the sugar program. At the time we passed the farm bill this summer, opponents of sugar reform were telling us that the program didn't cost taxpayers a dime. Now, just a few months later, the program is costing taxpayers \$250 million.

Sugar is the only commodity program in the farm bill that had no reform. Even as other commodities were modified to put more risk on farmers, sugar continues to get its sweet deal. Cotton, peanuts, dairy farmers will all see changes in the coming year, but not sugar farmers.

It is a sweet deal that is sour for consumers, for taxpayers, and for businesses across the country. For consumers, those who use sugar, high prices mean they are paying an additional \$3.5 billion a year. For taxpayers, low sugar prices mean bailouts rising to hundreds of millions of dollars. For businesses, for those who use and consume sugar in the food industry, high sugar prices place them at a distinct disadvantage to foreign competition.

The Department of Commerce estimates that 127,000 jobs were lost in food industries between 1997 and 2011. There are 600,000 jobs across the country at risk.

My resolution does not repeal the sugar program. It is very modest reform, modest reform that would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize the price of sugar. Stabilizing the price isn't just good for consumers, it is good for farmers who can rely on a more constant price and not be subject to wild swings in the market.

With the truth about the sugar program even more clear now, it is time we had an honest debate about fairness in our agriculture programs. This does not require the import of a single additional pound of sugar. It gives the Secretary flexibility to meet domestic demand.

So I urge Members to support the resolution and support the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise to oppose this motion because we have been trying to get this farm bill resolved since May of 2010, back when I was still chairman of the committee, so we have been working on it this long and we need to get this resolved. But what is being done here today is unprecedented as far as I can tell in the history of the House, where we are giving these two sense of the Congress resolutions to the majority.

From what I can tell, this has never been done before, and we are re-litigating issues that were settled on the floor of the House when we debated the

farm bill. These motions take a contrary position to the position that the House took, so we are going to be voting to go against the position that we took here just a couple of months ago. So that is my problem with this.

Historically, the minority gets a motion to instruct, and that has been the way it has been. In all the years that I have been here, that is the way it has been. But there's never been a situation like this. I think it is a bad precedent. It is going to be confusing to people, and we need to get to conference to get this resolved.

Given the way this conference appears it is going to be put together, I am not so optimistic that it is going to work because you are bringing people from outside of the committee into this process, which is what blew this thing up in the first place in June. And it's not going to make anything easier.

We are going to work together and try to get this resolved, but the way all this is coming down is making our job a lot harder, rather than a lot easier, which is the wrong direction, as far as I am concerned.

So I encourage Members to oppose this rule. This is unprecedented. It is apparently being done because that is the only way they can get the votes. And we are doing a lot of things around here because of that, and that is not the way we should do things.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2642 makes commonsense, market-oriented reforms to agricultural policy, which is why it is time to begin conversations with our Senate colleagues on a path forward that ultimately gets these important reforms enacted into law.

This bill isn't perfect, but it puts us on a path to provide certainty to America's farmers and ranchers by adopting a 5-year farm bill that will actually become law.

This measure is the result of more than 3 years of debate and discussion, including 46 hearings and a 2-year audit of every farm program. The bill repeals or consolidates more than 100 programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, including direct payments.

It eliminates and streamlines duplicative and overlapping conservation programs and trims traditional farm policy by almost \$23 billion. The bill eliminates direct payments and ensures no payments are made to those who do not actually farm.

The bill also provides regulatory relief for farmers and ranchers. It eliminates a duplicative permitting requirement for pesticides and prohibits the EPA from implementing the unjustified and unscientific biological opinions of the National Marine Fisheries Service until there is an unbiased, scientific peer review of those opinions.

The bill requires regulatory agencies across the government to use scientifically sound information in moving forward with their regulatory initiatives. It requires the Secretary of Agriculture to advocate on behalf of the

farmers and ranchers as other agencies move forward with regulations affecting food and fiber.

The bill also eliminates duplicative reporting requirements for seed importers.

Finally, H.R. 2642 repeals the underlying 1949 permanent law and replaces it with the 2013 farm bill. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because without reauthorization farm policy will revert to permanent statutes established in the 1938 and 1949 laws which are drastically different from current programs.

The permanent statutes exclude many commodities such as rice, soybeans, and peanuts; set support prices much higher than current levels; and prevent new enrollment in various conservation programs.

Permanent agriculture law established by the Agriculture Adjustments Act of 1938 and the Agriculture Act of 1949 does not reflect current farming and marketing practices, trade agreements or market circumstances.

Farmers, as well as taxpayers, will benefit from a modernized bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the ranking member on the Ag Committee, Mr. PETERSON, when he talks about kind of how unusual this process is with the sense of Congress resolutions that are put into this rule, basically, to instruct conferees on what to do.

It is highly unusual that the majority gives itself two of these sense of Congress resolutions. But this whole process has been really strange.

I would just say to my colleagues, I come to this floor every week and I talk about the issue of hunger and food insecurity in America. There are 50 million people who are hungry; 17 million are kids. I think it is something we all should be ashamed of.

I am on the Agriculture Committee, as well as being on the Rules Committee. I am on the Subcommittee on Nutrition. I was anxious to get on that committee so I could talk about the importance of a social safety net, about the importance of making sure that people in this country have enough to eat. Much to my surprise, Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Nutrition held a total of zero hearings on SNAP. The full committee held no hearings.

Then, even more surprising, Mr. Speaker, was that the nutrition title wasn't even written in the Agriculture Committee. It was written in the majority leader's back room somewhere by God knows who wrote this thing. But it never came to the Agriculture Committee.

It was never brought up for a hearing. There was no markup. There were no amendments that were to be offered. And then it showed up at the Rules Committee magically and was brought

to this floor, a \$40 billion cut that would throw 3.8 million people off the program, that would throw 170,000 veterans off the program.

No hearings, nothing. Nothing.

And my colleagues like to talk about regular order. That is not regular order. That is blowing up the whole process.

If my friends have concerns about the SNAP program, which, by the way, is the most efficiently and effectively-run Federal program we have, with one of the lowest error rates—I wish the Department of Defense had those kind of low error rates—then you hold a hearing.

You talk to the people who are on the program. You talk to the people who administer the program. You do this thoughtfully. You do it so that people who don't deserve to get the benefit don't get it, and people who deserve to get it get it.

But my friends come to the floor with this sledgehammer approach, this mindless approach of just gutting the program, close to \$40 billion.

We are slowly but surely getting out of this terrible economy, and as we do, fewer and fewer people will be on the program.

That is the way it works. When the economy is good, fewer people need the benefit. When the economy is bad, more people need the benefit.

But to pull the rug right from underneath people who are still struggling—my friends say all we want to do is make sure that able-bodied people who can work, work. Well, most of the people who are able to work, work, who are on SNAP, but they earn so little that they qualify for this benefit.

If my friends want to help lift people off the program, raise the minimum wage. But there is something wrong in this country when you have got people working full time and earning so little that they are still in poverty. That is what we should be addressing.

But rather than going through regular order, rather than having the Agriculture Committee, the committee of jurisdiction, come up with a proposal, the majority leader takes this in his own hands and does it on his own and brings it to the floor, and we are all supposed to just take it.

I want to, again, thank the handful of Republicans that had the guts to stand up and do the right thing and vote against it. We came very close to defeating it.

But I will tell my friends right now that people like me are not going to support a farm bill that makes more people hungry in America.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I respect my colleague from Massachusetts, and it is obvious that every time we have anything on this floor or in the Rules Committee where we are dealing with the subject of hunger that he is extraordinarily passionate about the issue.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans care about Americans who are hungry. We care about hunger issues. He makes it sound as though we are heartless people. We are not.

What we are doing here is our best to preserve the program for the truly needy and those who are hungry in this country.

My colleague says it is the most efficiently and effectively-run program in the country, with low error rates. That is not what the research shows. It isn't even what TV programs find out on their own with very little research.

They go out and they find the terrible abuse with the program, the SNAP program, which used to be called the food stamp program, but it was given this Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program name some time ago to get away from the term "food stamps." But that is what it is. It is a food stamp program.

Almost everybody in this country knows of people who have abused the program. Now, we don't want to deny help to truly needy people. If we can make these reforms in this program, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance to preserve the entire program for those who truly need it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013, as I said, is designed to preserve the integrity of the SNAP program, or food stamps for families, and especially for children who rely on food stamps. Its cost-saving reforms are a step in the right direction and are long overdue out of respect for needy Americans and taxpayers.

This bill makes the first reforms to the program since the Welfare Reform Act of 1996, and these reforms were strengthened during a rigorous amendment process on the House floor.

Despite media reports to the contrary, House Republicans are not cutting SNAP for individuals who currently meet the program's eligibility requirements. Instead, our reforms focus on eliminating fraud and abuse that exist within the program and remove from the programs individuals who do not qualify for the benefits.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I think that bears repeating. What we are doing is eliminating fraud and abuse and removing from the program individuals who do not qualify for benefits. That is what the American people expect us to do in our oversight processes here.

Because of several well-documented and legally questionable efforts by President Obama's Department of Agriculture and by the individual States that administer the program, SNAP benefits have been extended to a number of recipients who would not otherwise qualify. The growth in SNAP spending caused by such expansion efforts will strain the safety net until it breaks, necessitating much higher taxes and indiscriminate cuts that would hit the poorest Americans the

hardest. From a moral perspective, such an outcome would harm the very people programs like SNAP are intended to help, and that is unacceptable. That is why I voted for H.R. 3102 when it passed the House on September 19.

The bill ensures benefits are reserved for legal recipients and aren't directed to illegal immigrants.

The bill closes the "heat-and-eat" loophole related to electricity bill assistance, gives States the authority to require drug testing for recipients, and prohibits felons from receiving SNAP benefits.

H.R. 3102 reinstates work requirements for all able-bodied adults, without dependents, receiving SNAP benefits.

An overextended, unchecked SNAP program won't be capable of serving the citizens it is purposed to help. It is the job of this Congress to ensure the program is held accountable as a steward of taxpayer dollars and to provide a safety net for the needy.

For the first time, the House separated farm policy from the food stamp program, which is only appropriate, as 80 percent of the so-called "farm bill" in the past was spent on providing nutrition assistance to needy families. The farm-only portion of the farm bill authorizes farm programs through fiscal year 2018; however, H.R. 3102 authorizes appropriations for SNAP only through fiscal year 2016.

If enacted and if the two bills were addressed on 5- and 3-year intervals, respectively, this would decouple SNAP from the authorization of farm programs until 2031. Considering agriculture and nutrition programs independently, going forward, will help take politics out of the equation and allow for reforms that will sustain both categories of programs in years to come.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I strongly disagree with the gentleman's statement—strongly disagree. My friend talks about oversight. There were no hearings—none.

She talks about research somehow shows that there is lots of fraud, waste, and abuse. What research? The Government Accountability Office and the USDA have all documented fraud, waste, and abuse in the SNAP program, and it is minimal—a little over a 2 percent error rate—and much of that is underpayment. People are not getting what they are entitled to.

Enough of this demonizing poor people; enough of diminishing their struggle. We ought to do the right thing and make sure that people in this country have enough to eat. That shouldn't be a radical idea.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I could not agree more with my friend from Massa-

chusetts, who has actually spent the time getting inside this program. In fact, if the Republicans really care about hungry people in this country, these legislative efforts are a strange way to show it.

They are restricting the ability of Governors to grant waivers in places where people have no access to jobs. Governors, Republicans and Democrats alike, have requested these waivers because people need help, and the system couldn't meet their needs.

If they are concerned about fraud, waste, and abuse, look at the Crop Insurance Program, which has a higher rate of abuse than the miniscule amount with the food stamp program. And yet they are in the process not of reforming crop insurance, but enriching it and putting in another provision, the so-called "shallow loss" provision.

They are cutting benefits for poor people, increasing payments for wealthy farmers, and not dealing with simple, commonsense reforms that would give more value to the taxpayer—and not at the expense of the neediest Americans.

This is kind of a through-the-looking-glass situation. There are two proposals on the floor—"sense of Congress"—that I will probably support.

I have worked on a bipartisan basis to try and reform the egregious sugar program and to try and move in a modest sense to reform crop insurance, but we can do far more. And I note that these have bipartisan support.

It is outrageous that we are giving more money to farmers who need it least, shortchanging farmers and ranchers in States like mine in Oregon, cutting into the benefits for poor people who have no alternative, and taking away the right of the Governor to provide waivers for them.

It is an Alice-in-Wonderland situation that exemplifies the weird space that we are in today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If we would return to regular order, if we would have honest debate on this floor about getting more value for taxpayers, we could come forth with a farm bill at a fraction of what it costs now. It would be better for farmers and ranchers. It would be better for hunters and fishermen. It would be better for the environment and better for the taxpayer.

I strongly hope that we will stop this Alice-in-Wonderland experience, reopen the Federal Government, and get back to doing our job right.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule and the \$40 billion in disastrous cuts to the food stamp program that the House Republican majority is trying to make law.

This is a cut of \$40 billion from the food stamp program. It goes against decades of bipartisan support for the fight against hunger in the United States. It is a reflection of how extreme today's Republican Party has become. Even former Republican Senator Bob Dole has called these egregious cuts "an about-face on our progress fighting hunger."

If these cuts become law, over 4 million of the Nation's poorest citizens—children, seniors, veterans, and the disabled—would go hungry in the United States of America, the most bountiful Nation in the world. This is even as Republicans continue to give \$90 billion in crop insurance subsidies to some of America's wealthiest families and agribusiness.

For food stamp recipients that include a family of four, if their income is \$23,000 or less, that would give them eligibility for food stamps.

Let's talk about the Crop Insurance Program. You have got 26 beneficiaries of that program today who get at least a million dollars in a subsidy from U.S. taxpayers. They do not have any income threshold. They can get the money under any set of circumstances. And the top 1 percent of most farm operators in the Nation each get \$220,000.

You want to talk about the most needy? These are not the most needy. Cut out the \$90 billion in the subsidies to the richest people in the Nation.

The cuts are awful enough, but the majority's plan also includes cruel, mean-spirited restrictions. For instance, it encourages Governors to slash families from the food stamp rolls who cannot find work or a job training program for 20 hours a week. It rewards these Governors with half of the savings and allows them to use the money for tax cuts for the wealthy or whatever else they want.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Even if the food stamp recipient, including parents with young children and those with disabilities, is actively searching for a job, the House majority would end their benefits.

This is immoral. It goes against the values that we hold dear in the United States of America. Cutting 4 million Americans who live on the edge while providing subsidies for the wealthiest is wrong, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose the cruelty that this rule embodies.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule and this legislation underlying it is not designed to abuse or demonize poor people. What we are trying to do is to save these programs for the truly needy.

Mr. Speaker, we are not simply doing oversight on the farm bill and on agriculture issues. The House has been doing its job of oversight throughout the Federal Government. We have been

doing that throughout this entire session. We are looking to find fraud, abuse, and waste in every program. It just happens that today we are talking about this program.

But as you know, Mr. Speaker, almost every day we bring forth legislation that will help us identify waste, fraud, and abuse and do everything we can to protect hardworking taxpayers in this country who are providing the funds to take care of the truly needy in this country and to allow us to help those people, and that is what this legislation does.

Mr. Speaker, the work of making these improvements and reforms to longstanding Federal policy is not easy. I commend Chairman LUCAS and the members of the Agriculture Committee for their thoughtful work. I was pleased to work with them and to have three commonsense amendments included in H.R. 2642 when it passed the House.

The spending safeguard amendment will cap spending on the Farm Risk Management Election program at 110 percent of CBO-predicted levels for the first 5 years in which payments are disbursed.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this amendment passed with bipartisan support, as did most of the amendments to that legislation.

In the event government's cost projections prove completely wrong, the amendment will ensure taxpayers are not forced to automatically pay the difference between Washington's mistake and reality.

My second amendment, the Sunset Discretionary Programs amendment, will automatically end discretionary programs in the 2013 farm bill upon expiration of the bill's 5-year authorization period. Many programs authorized by the farm bill are authorized indefinitely. This amendment will require Congress to justify a program's continued existence and funding through regular reauthorization efforts.

As our national debt approaches \$17 trillion, Mr. Speaker, Congress simply cannot afford to add to the number of costly Federal programs that are on autopilot. This was really an excellent amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, Congressman KEITH ELLISON, my Democrat colleague, and I offered the crop insurance transparency amendment, which will require the government to disclose the names of key persons or entities receiving Federal crop insurance subsidies. Specifically, disclosure would be required for Members of Congress and their immediate families, Cabinet Secretaries and their immediate families, and entities in which any of the preceding parties are majority stockholders. This information is already recorded, but members of the public have to petition the government under the Freedom of Information Act to acquire the data.

□ 1445

It shouldn't take a 4-year request for the American people to figure out

whether their leaders are receiving government farm subsidies. This bipartisan amendment makes this information available to the public without a FOIA request.

Mr. Speaker, we want transparency, and my amendment takes us much closer to that. I appreciate Chairman LUCAS' willingness to work with me on these amendments, and I look forward to seeing them maintained during the conference committee.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague from North Carolina that I look forward to the day when she and her Republican colleagues bring to the floor a bill to go after fraud, waste, and abuse in defense contracting; but, instead, they have chosen to go after poor people and are not even giving them the benefit of a hearing. There has been no hearing, no markup on this at all. This came out of thin air in the majority leader's office. This wasn't even brought to the committee of jurisdiction. This is astounding. My friends are talking about reform. This isn't reform. This is a joke.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentlelady who is managing this legislation and indicate that I wish we did have, Mr. MCGOVERN, a bipartisan mission like Mickey Leland and Bill Emerson. If anybody remembers those late Members, they founded the Select Committee on Hunger in order to stamp out hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we had the kind of passion that drew Robert Kennedy to Appalachia to show America that the hunger that existed in this Nation was not a respecter of race or region—or maybe even the sensitivity of Martin Luther King in the same year. Tragically, they both lost their lives in 1968. He was galvanizing poor people to come to Washington because they wanted jobs, because they wanted to eat.

Here we are on the floor of the House, Mr. MCGOVERN, and I read from the statement made from the gentleman of Iowa last night on the floor that we need to start the long march to start to reform the expansion of the dependency class. Who is in the dependency class? There are charges that President Obama has put 48 million people on food stamps. How has President Obama put 48 million people on food stamps?

People are hungry, and 16 percent of the poor people in America are children. What our friends want to do with regard to reform is if you get a school lunch and a school breakfast, that is not evident that your family needs food stamps. So maybe this family is dysfunctional. Maybe these mothers and fathers are desperate, so now you are going to put them through another maze. You haven't documented that they are fraudulently taking food

stamps, but you are going to drop them off food stamps and say, Guys, if you want to get out of your hospice bed or if you want to get out of your sick bed or if you want to get out of your disabled bed and if you have these children who are getting lunch and breakfast, you have got to come and reapply, because there is something ingrained about those who are getting a hand up or who are in the dependency class.

I didn't say that. Robert Kennedy didn't say that.

Let's put a clean CR on the floor, by the way, to open the government, and let's stop talking about the idea. I just can't understand. We need a clean CR, and let's get it to the floor.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), who is the ranking member on the Nutrition Subcommittee on the Agriculture Committee. It is the subcommittee that should have held a hearing on this SNAP bill, but it never did.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just had the opportunity with 10 of my colleagues to go to a community shelter today to serve lunch to some of the poorest people in our community. The community shelter is So Others Might Eat, and I listen to my colleagues talk about waste, fraud, and abuse.

I am disappointed and embarrassed to serve in a House in which we would not want to take care of the poorest people in this Nation. Some of the poorest people in our Nation, many of them children, seniors, and veterans, depend on SNAP. SNAP puts food on the tables of struggling parents who need to send their children to school properly nourished. It also gives low-income working families—by the way, who represent nearly half of all SNAP recipients—and seniors the necessary support they need.

Last month, this House passed a bill that cut nearly \$40 billion in food stamps. It is both inappropriate and inexcusable to cut food assistance when more than 7 percent of the Nation remains unemployed and when we will not pass a jobs bill. Our economy is struggling to produce enough jobs so that families can eat without needing this assistance; and we all know that, beginning on November 1, SNAP recipients will see a reduction in their benefits when the 2009 Recovery Act's temporary benefits end. According to the CBO, benefits will be reduced by as much as \$300 per year. This cut will result in less food for more than 47 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, at some point we have to be honest with ourselves. We either have to believe that we are doing our jobs by taking care of the people of this country or that we are only taking care of a few.

So I say to those of you who believe that all of this is about fraud, waste,

and abuse: go to the same shelter that I went to today. Go into your neighborhoods and your communities, because we all have them. There are poor people and hungry children everywhere. I want you to go and tell them that it is okay for you to cut \$40 billion in food stamps.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a leader on this issue of food security and on so many other issues to combat poverty.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his determination to eliminate hunger, not only in our own country, but throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, there are 46 million Americans living in poverty, 16 million of whom are children. Instead of focusing on serious ways to lift people out of poverty and into the middle class, Republicans have insisted on placing a larger burden on the backs of the poor and the most vulnerable, effectively kicking them while they are down. That is what the Republicans' farm bill nutrition title did when it was passed on September 19. It would have decimated the anti-poverty SNAP program and would have left hundreds of millions of veterans, children, seniors, and millions of working poor hungry and with nowhere to turn for a meal. SNAP has one of the lowest fraud rates amongst government programs.

House Republicans were unsuccessful in their attempts to pass a farm bill this summer, so the Republican leadership doubled down on this immoral stance, surrendered the governing of the House down to the extreme Tea Party fringe of their party, and passed \$40 billion in cuts, which means cutting 24 meals a month for a family of four. This would be in addition, I might add, to SNAP cuts already scheduled to go into effect on November 1. This means about \$29 less per month for food for a family of three. These cuts to the SNAP program are really heartless. Let me tell you that I know from personal experience that the majority of people on food stamps wants a job that pays a living wage, and SNAP provides this bridge over troubled waters during very difficult times.

In my own congressional district, for example, over 22,000 households would have been impacted in more than 1.6 million homes throughout California. In 2011, SNAP lifted 4.7 million Americans out of poverty, including 2.1 million children. In addition to feeding the Nation's hungry, SNAP is vital to our economy. For every \$1 increase in SNAP benefits, we have received back in economic activity \$1.70.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Without SNAP, millions of families would fall

into poverty while millions more Americans would suffer extreme hunger and our economy would create even fewer jobs.

Let me remind you that millions of people on food stamps are working. Their wages are stagnant and low. Many make less than \$8 an hour; yet they are working every day to feed their families. Paying billions in farm subsidies and cutting SNAP benefits for the most vulnerable is not a value that a majority of Americans embrace. Cutting SNAP benefits is not the American way.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me inquire of the gentlewoman if she would be willing to yield us a few minutes on this side because we have a lot of speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I remember one time when I lent the gentlewoman a couple of minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans continue to demonstrate just how far out of whack their priorities are.

Here we are in the 11th day of the Republican government shutdown—a shutdown for the sole purpose of denying health care to millions of Americans. I guess America shouldn't be surprised. After all, last month, the majority pushed through severe, painful cuts to the nutrition programs for hungry families. We are now moving toward going to a conference with the Senate on these damaging cuts. By insisting on these nearly \$40 billion in cuts, the Republicans have made clear where they stand, even clearer where they don't stand.

Now, understand. I know that the gentlewoman talks about the truly needy, but what she is really saying is that the somewhat needy, the sorta needy, the kinda needy, the "needy" needy need not apply because they are not in need of food stamps. When you look at the number of \$20 billion, it was the original number, which is a block number, and it was without consequences to who they would hurt.

When that failed, they said, What would work? Let's use \$40 billion. Yes, \$40 billion will do it—a nice, neat number without any consequences to who might get hurt. Someone had a bright idea on the other side and said that this number will work, and it was without a rationale for the number and without any understanding of what the impact would be.

So we know where they stand. They don't stand with 900,000 veterans who receive food assistance each month.

They don't stand with 2.1 million children who have been kept out of poverty by the food stamp program. They don't stand with the seniors who have to choose between food and medicine—or with the families of disabled children or with our military families who turn to food stamps to stretch their budgets. Heaven forbid we suggest taking away subsidies from Big Oil or tax breaks from owners of corporate jets.

What does that say about Republican priorities and their vision? The fact is that their vision leads to a world in which millions more go hungry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CROWLEY. In New York City alone, the Republicans' cut would result in 130 million fewer meals. That is unacceptable to me, and it ought to be unacceptable to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The fact that it is not unacceptable tells us something we need to know about our Republican colleagues' view of struggling families in this country: they don't care about their struggles. They wouldn't recognize a needy person if they tripped over him on the street outside the Capitol.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I would challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in terms of whether we recognize poor people or not. Some of us probably grew up poorer than anybody on the other side of the aisle. I am one of those people. I have great empathy for people who are poor, but I am so pleased that we live in the greatest country in the world in which we have the opportunities to overcome poverty because of the great opportunities that are given to us in the country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of comity and goodness, I yield the 3 minutes that is requested of me to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts has an additional 3 minutes to control.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her graciousness in allowing my side a few more minutes. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on the Senate's clean continuing resolution so that we can send it to the President for his signature today and end this government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

□ 1500

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of goodness, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we would end this idiotic government shutdown and not go on recess later today. The American people expect us to act today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we may end this irresponsible Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this unnecessary Republican shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I again ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can finally end this Republican shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, a request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end the Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from

Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, so that we can go to conference on a budget so we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support the idea of the House and Senate reconciling their differences on the farm bill and going to conference. It is certainly long overdue.

I caution, however, that I will not vote for deep cuts in the SNAP program or the food stamp program, nor do I believe that Democrats will vote to take food away from those Americans who suffer from food insecurity. They have shut down the government, and now they want to shut down food assistance to the most vulnerable, many of whom live in my congressional district.

Open up the government, open up food banks, open up Meals on Wheels for seniors, and give a hand to those who are hurting. It is good for families, and it is good for farmers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished Member of the Democratic leadership.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this bill because I have worked very hard over the years helping to put together various farm bills, and this is one that I felt very, very good about from the outset. I even felt okay when the bill came back from the Senate. Although I had some issues with the Senate version, I thought that what we were doing made some sense.

But we have reached a point with this bill—\$40 billion in cuts to the food stamp program—that will not only impact negatively those people who would receive those stamps in fighting off poverty or hunger, but it would do tremendous harm to various community outlets—stores, family-owned markets—where so much of the income of small businesses depend upon this program and what it will do to help further the economy in various communities.

I am also very concerned that in this legislation, we treat the recipients of food stamps as if they are responsible for what may or may not have taken place with respect to drug addiction to children or to siblings. I think there is something erroneous about drug testing in order to receive food stamps. I

think that if you are going to have drug testing to get Federal assistance, then we ought to test all those people who get farm subsidies and see whether or not they are deserving of such assistance from the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Then I saw some reference as to whether or not people who may have been convicted of a felony, what it would do to their qualifications, as well as their family qualifications. At one instance—I hope this is out of the bill—we talked about barring for life a person who may be convicted of a felony. That is not the kind of treatment our society ought to be visiting upon anybody who may or may not have made a mistake early on in their lives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that there is much in this farm bill that ought to be supported, but I really believe these extraneous things ought to be taken out of this bill. We can't do it now, but I would hope when it gets to conference that those cooler heads will prevail, and we will have a compassionate piece of legislation that all of us can support.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, several unanimous consent requests have been offered and have been ruled out of order because they have not been pre-cleared by bipartisan leadership. It is my understanding that they have, in fact, been pre-cleared by the Democratic side.

Would it be in order to ask the Republicans if they would pre-clear the unanimous consent requests so that we can vote up or down on a clean CR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker's guidelines to clear a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining, and whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining, and the gentlelady from North Carolina has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I close, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House

bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown. It is the right thing to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding us additional time. It is important, I think, that we be heard on these issues.

One of the reasons why we are so passionate about reopening the government is because this government shutdown is hurting people, and it is hurting the most vulnerable people in our society the most.

One of the things that has troubled me about the direction the Republican leadership has taken in this Congress is that it has become unfashionable to worry about the poor and the vulnerable in this people's House of Representatives. Time and time and time again, my friends seek to balance the budget by cutting programs that help the most vulnerable. The \$40 billion cut in SNAP will throw 3.8 million poor people off the program, it will throw children off the program, it will throw working people off the program.

A lot of the people—contrary to what my friends say—who are on SNAP work for a living, they work full time. If you are earning minimum wage working full time, you still qualify for SNAP.

There are people in this country who are hurting, who are depending upon us to be there, to make sure that there is a social safety net that will make sure that people don't fall through the cracks.

One of the reasons we object to this nutrition provision in the farm bill is because it will hurt people—it will hurt people. We were sent here to help people. This used to be a bipartisan issue. Democrats and Republicans need to join together on this.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and vote “no” on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Republicans want to see the government reopen also. We have sent many pieces of legislation over to the Senate, but the Senate has refused to act on them. We hope very much to get the government open again.

We are not opposed to helping the truly needy in this country. We want to help those people. We believe by reforming the legislation related to food stamps that we will be able to save the program for the truly needy.

Mr. Speaker, negotiations are an absolute necessity in a divided government, and conference committees provide an avenue for the House and Senate to meet and resolve policy differences.

□ 1515

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule, to provide a

motion to go to conference on the farm bill so we can move the reauthorization process forward.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 380 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, shall be taken from the Speaker's table and the pending question shall be, without intervention of any point of order, whether the House shall recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of receding from the House amendment and concurring in the Senate amendment without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in section 4 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule When the motion for the previous question is defeated,

control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland seek recognition?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on either side of the aisle have stated their preference for, as the gentlelady from North Carolina said, opening the government. They want to open the government as soon as possible and would vote for a clean bill.

Mr. Speaker, we can have that vote right now. I would like to give my colleagues the opportunity to be heard right now in this Chamber and show the American people whether they want to reopen the government today or not.

Mr. Speaker, as a result, I request that this vote be conducted by a roll-call under clause 2 of House rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those in favor of the yeas and nays will rise and be counted.

A sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays are ordered.

In response to the gentleman from Maryland, under clause 2(a) of rule XX, a record vote is conducted by electronic device unless the Speaker directs otherwise. This vote will be conducted by electronic device.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Does that mean if you ruled that we would take the vote in the manner in which I requested, that we would do so?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Speaker's discretion, and the Chair advises that this vote will be conducted by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 193, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Grimm	Pitts
Amash	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Amodei	Hall	Pompeo
Bachus	Hanna	Posey
Barletta	Harper	Price (GA)
Barr	Harris	Radel
Barton	Hartzler	Reed
Benish	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Bentivolio	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rice (SC)
Black	Hudson	Rigell
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Roby
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Rokita
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Jones	Roskam
Calvert	Joyce	Ross
Camp	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Campbell	King (IA)	Royce
Cantor	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Kingston	Salmon
Carter	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanford
Cassidy	Kline	Schock
Chabot	Labrador	Schweikert
Chaffetz	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Lance	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Latham	Shuster
Conaway	Latta	Simpson
Coak	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Cotton	Long	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Southerland
Denham	Marchant	Stewart
Dent	Marino	Stivers
DeSantis	Massie	Stockman
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Terry
Duffy	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Tiberi
Ellmers	McKinley	Tipton
Farenthold	McMorris	Turner
Fincher	Rodgers	Upton
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Valadao
Fleischmann	Meehan	Wagner
Fleming	Messer	Walberg
Flores	Mica	Walden
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Garrett	Neugebauer	Williams
Gerlach	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Nugent	Wittman
Gibson	Nunes	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Womack
Goodlatte	Olson	Woodall
Gosar	Palazzo	Yoder
Gowdy	Paulsen	Yoho
Graves (GA)	Pearce	Young (AK)
Graves (MO)	Perry	Young (IN)
Griffin (AR)	Petri	
Griffith (VA)	Pittenger	

NAYS—193

Andrews	Bera (CA)	Braley (IA)
Barber	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (NY)	Brownley (CA)
Bass	Blumenauer	Bustos
Beatty	Bonamici	Butterfield
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Capps

Capuano	Honda	Pastor (AZ)
Cárdenas	Horsford	Payne
Carney	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Peters (CA)
Cartwright	Israel	Peters (MI)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Cicilline	Kaptur	Polis
Clarke	Keating	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Clyburn	Kennedy	Rahall
Cohen	Kildee	Rangel
Connolly	Kilmer	Richmond
Conyers	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Costa	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	T.
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lipinski	Schiff
DeGette	Loeb	Schneider
Delaney	Lofgren	Schrader
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Schwartz
DelBene	Lowe	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Scott, David
Dingell	(NM)	Serrano
Doggett	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sewell (AL)
Doyle	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Duckworth	Lynch	Sherman
Edwards	Maffei	Sinema
Ellison	Maloney	Sires
Engel	Carolyn	Smith (WA)
Enyart	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Eshoo	Matheson	Swalwell (CA)
Esty	Matsui	Takano
Farr	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Fattah	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Foster	McGovern	Tierney
Frankel (FL)	McIntyre	Titus
Fudge	McNerney	Tonko
Gabbard	Meeks	Tsongas
Galleo	Meng	Van Hollen
Garamendi	Michaud	Vargas
Garcia	Miller, George	Veasey
Grayson	Moore	Vela
Green, Al	Moran	Velázquez
Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Grijalva	Nadler	Walz
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Wasserman
Hahn	Neal	Schultz
Hanabusa	Negrete McLeod	Waters
Hastings (FL)	Nolan	Watt
Heck (WA)	O'Rourke	Waxman
Himes	Owens	Welch
Hinojosa	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Holt	Pascrell	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann	Granger	Runyan
Clay	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Coble	Higgins	Scalise
Crawford	Jeffries	Slaughter
Crenshaw	Jordan	Young (FL)
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	
Gohmert	Pelosi	

□ 1540

Mr. GARCIA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BRADY of Texas and MEEHAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 189, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

AYES—223

Aderholt Griffith (VA) Petri
 Amash Grimm Pittenger
 Amodei Guthrie Pitts
 Bachus Hall Poe (TX)
 Barber Hanna Pompeo
 Barletta Harper Posey
 Barr Harris Price (GA)
 Barton Hartzler Radel
 Benishek Hastings (WA) Reed
 Bentivolio Heck (NV) Reichert
 Bilirakis Hensarling Renacci
 Bishop (UT) Holding Ribble
 Black Hudson Rice (SC)
 Blackburn Huelskamp Rigell
 Boustany Huizenga (MI) Roby
 Brady (TX) Hultgren Roe (TN)
 Bridenstine Hunter Rogers (AL)
 Brooks (AL) Hurt Rogers (KY)
 Brooks (IN) Issa Rogers (MI)
 Broun (GA) Jenkins Rohrabacher
 Buchanan Johnson (OH) Rokita
 Bucshon Johnson, Sam Rooney
 Burgess Joyce Ros-Lehtinen
 Calvert Kelly (PA) Roskam
 Camp King (IA) Ross
 Campbell King (NY) Rothfus
 Cantor Kingston Royce
 Capito Kinzinger (IL) Ryan (WI)
 Carter Kline Salmon
 Cassidy Labrador Sanford
 Chabot LaMalfa Schock
 Chaffetz Lamborn Schweikert
 Coffman Lance Scott, Austin
 Cole Lankford Sensenbrenner
 Collins (GA) Latham Sessions
 Collins (NY) Latta Shimkus
 Conaway LoBiondo Shuster
 Cook Long Simpson
 Cotton Lucas Smith (MO)
 Cramer Luetkemeyer Smith (NE)
 Daines Lummis Smith (NJ)
 Davis, Rodney Maffei Smith (TX)
 Denham Marchant Southerland
 Dent Marino Stewart
 DeSantis Massie Stivers
 DesJarlais McCarthy (CA) Stockman
 Diaz-Balart McCaul Stutzman
 Duffy McClintock Terry
 Duncan (SC) McHenry Thompson (PA)
 Duncan (TN) McKeon Thornberry
 Ellmers McKinley Tiberi
 Farenthold McMorris Tipton
 Fincher Rodgers Turner
 Fitzpatrick Meadows Upton
 Fleischmann Meehan Valadao
 Fleming Messer Wagner
 Flores Mica Walberg
 Forbes Michaud Walden
 Fortenberry Miller (FL) Walorski
 Foxx Miller (MI) Weber (TX)
 Franks (AZ) Miller, Gary Webster (FL)
 Frelinghuysen Mullin Wenstrup
 Garamendi Mulvaney Westmoreland
 Gardner Murphy (PA) Whitfield
 Garrett Neugebauer Williams
 Gerlach Noem Wilson (SC)
 Gibbs Nugent Wittman
 Gibson Nunes Wolf
 Gingrey (GA) Nunnelee Womack
 Goodlatte Olson Woodall
 Gosar Owens Yoder
 Gowdy Palazzo Yoho
 Graves (GA) Paulsen Young (AK)
 Graves (MO) Pearce Young (IN)
 Griffin (AR) Perry

NOES—189

Andrews Carney Davis (CA)
 Barrow (GA) Carson (IN) Davis, Danny
 Bass Cartwright DeFazio
 Beatty Castor (FL) DeGette
 Becerra Castro (TX) Delaney
 Bera (CA) Chu DeLauro
 Bishop (GA) Cicilline DelBene
 Bishop (NY) Clarke Deutch
 Blumenauer Cleaver Dingell
 Bonamici Clyburn Doggett
 Brady (PA) Cohen Doyle
 Braley (IA) Connolly Duckworth
 Brown (FL) Conyers Edwards
 Brownley (CA) Cooper Ellison
 Bustos Costa Engel
 Butterfield Courtney Enyart
 Capps Crowley Eshoo
 Capuano Cuellar Esty
 Cárdenas Cummings Farr

Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garcia
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heck (WA)
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann
 Clay
 Coble
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Gohmert
 Granger
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins
 Jeffries
 Jordan
 McCarthy (NY)
 Pelosi

□ 1551

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
 the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I was not
 present during roll No. 544, on agreeing to H.
 Res. 380. Had I been present, I would have
 voted "aye."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The un-
 finished business is the question on
 agreeing to the Speaker's approval of
 the Journal, which the Chair will put
 de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's ap-
 proval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Jour-
 nal stands approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF AD-
MINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE
HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid be-
 fore the House the following commu-
 nication from the Chief Administrative
 Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRA-
 TIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REP-
 RESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, October 10, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
 Speaker, House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, this is to notify you
 formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules
 of the House of Representatives that I have
 been served with a subpoena, issued by the
 United States District Court for the District
 of Columbia, for documents in a third-party
 civil case.

After consultation with the Office of Gen-
 eral Counsel, I have determined that compli-
 ance with the subpoena is consistent with
 the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. STRODEL,
 Chief Administrative Officer.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES
ON H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK
MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant
 to House Resolution 380, I move to take
 from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R.
 2642) to provide for the reform and con-
 tinuation of agricultural and other pro-
 grams of the Department of Agri-
 culture through fiscal year 2018, and
 for other purposes, with the House
 amendment to the Senate amendment
 thereto, insist on the House amend-
 ment, and agree to the conference re-
 quested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.
 YODER). The gentleman from Okla-
 homa is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield
 back the balance of my time, and I
 move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
 question is on the motion offered by
 the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr.
 LUCAS).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
 the table.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have
 a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
 Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peterson moves that the managers on
 the part of the House at the conference on
 the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on
 the House Amendment to the Senate amend-
 ment to the bill H.R. 2642 (an Act to provide
 for the reform and continuation of agricul-
 tural and other programs of the Department
 of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and
 for other purposes) be instructed to (1) re-
 cede to section 1602 of the Senate amend-
 ment (relating to suspension of permanent
 price support authority) and (2) recede to the
 Senate position in title IV of the Senate
 amendment providing at a minimum a five-
 year duration of the Supplemental Nutrition
 Assistance Program and other nutrition pro-
 grams.

Mr. PETERSON (during the reading).
 Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent
 to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
 objection to the request of the gen-
 tleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 1600

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This motion contains two instructions for the farm bill conferees. One is to support the permanent law provisions in the Senate farm bill and what we currently have and have had for years and years. The second is to support the Senate position of a 5-year reauthorization of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

To be clear, this motion keeps intact the longstanding alliance needed to pass a strong farm bill.

America's two largest farm organizations, the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Farmers Union, both wrote in opposition to the House's original consideration of H.R. 2642, the "farm only" farm bill.

Farm Bureau president Bob Stallman wrote:

It is frustrating to our members that this broad coalition of support for passage of the COMPLETE farm bill appears to have been pushed aside in favor of interests that have no real stake in this farm bill, the economic vitality and jobs agriculture provides in this country, or for the customers ranchers and farmers serve.

The Farm Bureau joined a broad coalition of 532 agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance groups that expressed their opposition to splitting the nutrition title from the farm bill and urged House leaders to pass a 5-year farm bill.

When such a large group of organizations, most with different if not conflicting priorities, can come together and agree on something, we should listen to them. Doing the exact opposite of what everyone with a stake in this bill recommends does not make sense, and it is not the way to achieve success, in my opinion.

I will insert both the Farm Bureau and coalition letters into the RECORD.

The farm bill's nutrition program needs to be on the same timeline as the bill's other provisions. It makes no sense to de-couple farm and food programs; they go hand in hand. I worry that separating the two of them sets us on a path to no farm bill in the future. The Senate farm bill preserves the partnership between farm and food programs, and we should defer to that approach.

As Farmers Union president Roger Johnson wrote:

Repealing permanent law would remove the element of the bill which would force Congress to act on a piece of legislation that provides a safety net for farmers and ranchers and the food insecure in this country, and protects our Nation's natural resources.

I will insert the Farmers Union letter into the RECORD.

The permanent law provisions are important to ensuring that Congress revisits farm programs every 5 years. These are farm laws from 1938 and 1949 that, if Congress does not pass a new farm bill, would go into effect. Actually, because we have not passed a farm bill at this point, and it expired on October 1, we actually are operating under permanent law right now.

Obviously, farming has changed a lot since then, and everybody knows these programs don't make a lot of sense today, but that's the point of permanent law. It is the reason that we work together and we pass a new farm bill, because the alternative is not very acceptable.

Farm bills are traditionally a compromise, and there are things that some people like and things that some people don't like. Permanent law encourages both groups to work together because no one wants to go back to the outdated and unworkable farm programs of 1938 and 1949.

Without these permanent law provisions, it will make it more difficult to make changes, improvements, and reforms over time as we discover that they are needed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this motion to instruct, and I reserve the balance of my time.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
July 11, 2013.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: National Farmers Union (NFU) strongly urges you to vote against the rule and final passage of H.R. 2642, a bill that divorces the nutrition title from the rest of the farm bill and repeals permanent law.

The two largest general farm organizations in the country have spoken out multiple times in opposition to separating nutrition programs from the farm bill. Splitting the bill is a shortsighted strategy that would effectively undermine the long-standing bipartisan coalition of rural and urban members that have traditionally supported passage of a unified bill. We are also very concerned that including a provision that would repeal permanent law did not receive any outside scrutiny or ability to weigh in through hearings. Repealing permanent law would remove the element in the bill which would force Congress to act on a piece of legislation that provides a safety net for farmers, ranchers, the food insecure and protects our nation's natural resources.

Last week, NFU led a coalition of 531 other organizations in writing a letter calling for the House of Representatives not to split the bill. This broad-based coalition, composed of agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance companies and organizations is now being undermined by extreme partisan political organizations that do not represent constituents affected by the farm bill.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter. We urge you to vote against the rule and final passage of H.R. 2642 and encourage leadership to bring a unified bill to the floor as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

ROGER JOHNSON,
President.

AMERICAN FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2013.

The Hon.
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP.: The American Farm Bureau Federation is our nation's largest general farm organization, representing more than 6 million member families in all 50 states and Puerto Rico. Our members represent the grassroots farmers and ranchers who produce the wide range of food and fiber crops for our customers here and around the world. To achieve this, farmers and ranchers depend on the variety of programs such as risk management, conservation, credit and rural development contained in H.R. 2642 that is scheduled to be voted on by the full House today.

Last night the House Rules Committee approved the rule for considering H.R. 2642, which also includes separating the nutrition title from the remaining provisions of H.R. 1947, a complete farm bill that was reported out of the House Agriculture Committee by a 36-10 bipartisan vote.

We are very disappointed in this action. The "marriage" between the nutrition and farm communities and our constituents in developing and adopting comprehensive farm legislation has been an effective, balanced arrangement for decades that has worked to ensure all Americans and the nation benefits. In spite of reports to the contrary, this broad food and farm coalition continues to hold strong against partisan politics. In fact, last week, more than 530 groups representing the farm, conservation, credit, rural development and forestry industries urged the House to not split the bill. Similar communications were relayed from the nutrition community. Yet today, in spite of the broad-based bipartisan support for keeping the farm bill intact, you will vote on an approach that seeks to affect a divorce of this longstanding partnership. It is frustrating to our members that this broad coalition of support for passage of a complete farm bill appears to have been pushed aside in favor of interests that have no real stake in this farm bill, the economic vitality and jobs agriculture provides or the customers farmers and ranchers serve.

We are quite concerned that without a workable nutrition title, it will prove to be nearly impossible to adopt a bill that can be successfully conferenced with the Senate's version, approved by both the House and Senate and signed by the President.

We are also very much opposed to the repeal of permanent law contained in H.R. 2642. This provision received absolutely no discussion in any of the process leading up to the passage of the bill out of either the House or Senate Agriculture Committees. To replace permanent law governing agricultural programs without hearing from so much as a single witness on what that law should be replaced with is not how good policy is developed.

As recently as last December, the threat of reverting to permanent law was the critical element that forced Congress to pass an extension of the current farm bill when it proved impossible to complete action on the new five-year farm bill—an action that not only provided important safety net programs for this year, it ensured Congress would have time this year to consider comprehensive reforms that contribute billions to deficit reduction.

We urge you to oppose the rule as well to vote against final passage of this attempt to split the farm bill and end permanent law provisions for agriculture.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

JULY 2, 2013.

The Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
H-232 The Capitol, Washington, DC

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: America's agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance companies and organizations strongly urge you to bring the Farm Bill (H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013) back to the Floor as soon as possible. This important legislation supports our nation's farmers, ranchers, forest owners, food security, natural resources and wildlife habitats, rural communities, and the 16 million Americans whose jobs directly depend on the agriculture industry.

Farm bills represent a delicate balance between America's farm, nutrition, conservation, and other priorities, and accordingly require strong bipartisan support. It is vital for the House to try once again to bring together a broad coalition of lawmakers from both sides of the aisle to provide certainty for farmers, rural America, the environment and our economy in general and pass a five-year farm bill upon returning in July. We believe that splitting the nutrition title from the rest of the bill could result in neither farm nor nutrition programs passing, and urge you to move a unified farm bill forward.

Thank you for your support. We look forward to our continued dialogue as the process moves forward and stand ready to work with you to complete passage of the new five-year Farm Bill before the current law expires again on September 30, 2013.

Sincerely,

1st Farm Credit Services, Advanced Biofuels Association, Ag Credit, ACA, AgChoice, AgGeorgia, AgHeritage Farm Credit Services AgriBank, Agriculture Council of Arkansas Agriculture Energy Coalition, Agricultural Retailers Association AgriLand, Agri-Mark, Inc., AgCarolina, AgCountry, AgFirst, AgPreference, AgSouth, AgStar Financial Services, ACA AgTexas, Alabama Ag Credit, Alabama Cotton Commission, Alabama Dairy Producers, Alabama Farm Credit, Alabama Farmers Cooperative, Alabama Farmers Federation.

Alabama Pork Producers, Alaska Farmers Union, American AgCredit, American Agriculture Movement, American Association of Avian Pathologists, American Association of Bovine Practitioners, American Association of Crop Insurers, American Association of Small Ruminant Practitioners, American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, American Bankers Association, American Beekeeping Federation, American Biogas Council, American Coalition for Ethanol, American Cotton Shippers Association, American Crystal Sugar Company, American Dairy Science Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Farmers and Ranchers Mutual Insurance Company, American Farmland Trust, American Feed Industry Association, American Fruit and Vegetable Processors and Growers Coalition, American Forest Foundation, American Forest Resource Council, American Forests, American Honey Producers Association.

American Malting Barley Association, American Pulse Association, American Public Works Association, American Sheep Industry Association, American Society of Agronomy, American Sugar Alliance, American Sugar Cane League, American Sugarbeet Growers Association, American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, American Soybean Association, American Veterinary Medical Association, Animal Agriculture Coalition, Animal Health Institute, WAArborOne, Archery Trade Association, Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, Arizona BioIndustry Association, Arizona Wool Producers Association, Arkansas Farm Bureau,

Arkansas Farmers Union, Arkansas Rice Federation, Arkansas Rice Producers' Group, Arkansas State Sheep Council, Associated Logging Contractors—Idaho, Associated Milk Producers, Inc.

Associated Oregon Loggers, Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Association of Veterinary Biologics Companies, Badgerland Financial, Bio Nebraska Life Sciences Association, BioForward, Biotechnology Industry Organization, Black Hills Forest Resource Association, Bongard's Creamery, Boone and Crockett Club, Bowhunting Preservation Alliance, Calcot, California Agricultural Irrigation Association, California Association of Resource Conservation Districts, California Association of Winegrape Growers, California Avocado Commission, California Canning Peach Association, California Farm Bureau Federation, California Farmers Union, California Forestry Association, California Pork Producers Association, California Wool Growers Association, Calvin Viator, Ph.D. and Associates, LLC.

The Campbell Group, Can Manufacturers Institute, Canned Food Alliance, Cape Fear Farm Credit, Capital Farm Credit, Carolina Cotton Growers Cooperative, Catch-A-Dream Foundation, Catfish Farmers of America, Central Kentucky, ACA, Ceres Solutions LLP, Chrisholm Trail Farm Credit, CHS, Inc., CoBank, Colonial Farm Credit, Colorado BioScience Association, Colorado Farm Bureau, Colorado Timber Industry Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Connecticut Forest & Park Association, Connecticut United for Research Excellence, Inc., The Conservation Fund, Continental Dairy Products, Inc., Cooperative Credit Company, Cooperative Network, Cora-Texas Mfg. Co., Inc.

Corn Producers Association of Texas, Cotton Growers Warehouse Association, Council for Agricultural Science and Technology, Crop Insurance and Reinsurance Bureau, Crop Insurance Professionals Association, Crop Science Society of America, CropLife America, Dairy Farmers of America, Dairy Farmers Working Together, Dairy Producers of Utah, DairyLea Cooperative Inc., Darigold, Inc., Delta Council, Delta Waterfowl, Deltic Timber Corporation, Ducks Unlimited, DUDA (A. Duda & Sons, Inc.), Eastern Regional Conference of Council of State Governments, Empire State Forest Products Association, Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Family Farm Alliance, Family Forest Foundation—Washington, Farm Credit Bank of Texas, Farm Credit Banks Funding Corporation.

Farm Credit Council, Farm Credit Council Services, Farm Credit East, Farm Credit MidSouth, Farm Credit of Central Florida, Farm Credit of Central Oklahoma, Farm Credit of Enid, Farm Credit of Florida, Farm Credit of Maine, Farm Credit of Ness City, Farm Credit of New Mexico, Farm Credit of North West Florida, Farm Credit of Southern Colorado, Farm Credit of SW Kansas, Farm Credit of Western Arkansas, Farm Credit of Western Kansas, Farm Credit of Western Oklahoma, Farm Credit Services of America, Farm Credit Services of Illinois, Farm Credit South, Farm Credit Virginias, Farm Credit West, Farmer Mac, FarmFirst Dairy Cooperative, FCS Financial.

FCS of America, FCS of Colusa-Glenn, FCS of East/Central Oklahoma, FCS of Hawaii, FCS of Illinois, FCS of Mandan, FCS of Mid-America, FCS of North Dakota, FCS of Southwest, Federation of Animal Science Societies, First District Association, First FCS, First South Farm Credit, FLBA of Kingsburg, Florida Fruit and Vegetable As-

sociation, Florida Sugar Cane League, Forest Investment Associates, Forest Landowners Association, Forest Products National Labor Management Committee, Forest Resource Association Inc., Fresno-Madera Farm Credit, Frontier Farm Credit, Fruit Growers Supply Company, Georgia Agribusiness Council, Georgia Farm Bureau Federation, Georgia Forestry Association.

Georgia Pork Producers Association, Giustina Resources, LLC, Global Forest Partners LP, GMO Renewable Resources, Great Plains Ag Credit, Great Plains Canola Association, Green Diamond Resource Company, Greenstone, GROWMARK, Inc, Growth Energy, Hancock Timber Resource Group, Hardwood Federation, Hawaii Farmers Union, Hawaii Sugar Farmers, Heritage Land Bank, Holstein Association USA, Idaho Ag Credit, Idaho Dairymen's Association, Idaho Farmers Union, Idaho Forest Group, Idaho Forest Owners Association, Idaho Grain Producers Association, Illinois Biotechnology Industry Organization—iBIO®, Illinois Farm Bureau, Illinois Farmers Union.

Illinois Pork Producers Association, Independent Beef Association of North Dakota, Independent Community Bankers of America, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indiana Farmers Union, Indiana Health Industry Forum, Innovative Mississippi—Strategic Biomass Solutions, Intermountain Forest Association, Intertribal Agriculture Council, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, Iowa Farmers Union, Iowa Pork Producers Association, Iowa Sheep Industry Association, IowaBio, Irrigation Association, Irving Woodlands, LLC, Izaak Walton League of America, John Deere Crop Insurance, Kansas Cooperative Council, Kansas Dairy, Kansas Farm Bureau, Kansas Farmers Union, Kansas Grain Sorghum Producers Association, Kansas Pork Association, Kansas Sheep Association.

Kentucky Forest Industries Association, Kentucky Pork Producers Association, Land Improvement Contractors of America, Land O'Lakes, Land Stewardship Project, Land Trust Alliance, Lone Rock Timber Management Co., Longview Timber LLC, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Louisiana Forest Association, Louisiana Rice Growers Association, Louisiana Rice Producers' Group, Louisiana Sugar Cane Cooperative, Inc., Lula-Westfield, LLC, Maryland & Virginia Milk Producers Cooperative, Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., Maryland Grain Producers Association, Maryland Sheep Breeders' Association, Inc., Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Massachusetts Forest Alliance, MassBio, MBG Marketing/The Blueberry People, Michigan Agri-Business Association, Michigan Farm Bureau.

Michigan Farmers Union, Michigan Pork Producers Association, Michigan Sugar Company, Michigan-California Timber Company, Mid-West Dairymen's Co., MidAtlantic Farm Credit, Midwest Dairy Coalition, Midwest Environmental Advocates, Midwest Food Processors Association, Milk Producers Council, Minn-Dak Farmers Cooperative, Minnesota Canola Council, Minnesota Corn Growers Association, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, Minnesota Farmers Union, Minnesota Forest Industries, Minnesota Grain & Feed Association, Minnesota Lamb & Wool Producers, Minnesota Pork Producers Association, Minnesota Timber Producers Association, Mississippi River Trust, Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Missouri Dairy Association, Missouri Farm Bureau Federation, Missouri Farmers Union.

Missouri Pork Association, Missouri Sheep Producers, Missouri Soybean Association, The Molpus Woodlands Group, Montana Grain Growers Association, Montana Farmers Union, Mule Deer Foundation, National

Association of Counties, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, National All-Jersey, National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Association for the Advancement of Animal Science, National Association of Clean Water Agencies, National Association of Conservation Districts, National Association of Farmer Elected Committees, National Association of Federal Veterinarians, National Association of Forest Service Retirees, National Association of FSA County Office Employees, National Association of Resource Conservation & Development Councils, National Association of State Conservation Agencies, National Association of State Foresters, National Association of University Forest Resource Programs, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Barley Growers Association, National Bobwhite Conservation Initiative.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference, National Coalition for Food and Agricultural Research, National Conservation District Employees Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Cotton Ginners' Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Farmers Union, National Farm to School Network, National Grange, National Grape Cooperative Association, Inc., National Milk Producers Federation, National Network of Forest Practitioners, National Pork Producers Council, National Renderers Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Sorghum Producers, National Sunflower Association, National Trappers Association, National Wild Turkey Federation, National Woodland Owners Association, Nebraska Cooperative Council, Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, Nebraska Farmers Union, Nebraska Pork Producers Association.

Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, Nevada Wool Growers Association, New England Farmers Union, New Jersey Farm Bureau, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau, New Mexico Sorghum Association, New York Farm Bureau, Inc., New York Forest Owners Association, Nextsteppe, North American Grouse Partnership, North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., North Carolina Forestry Association, North Carolina Pork Council, North Dakota Farmers Union, North Dakota Lamb & Wool Producers, North Dakota Pork Producers Council, Northharvest Bean Growers Association, Northeast Dairy Farmers Cooperatives, Northeast States Association for Agricultural Stewardship, Northern California Farm Credit, Northern Canola Growers Association, Northern Forest Center, Northern Pulse Growers Association, Northwest Dairy Association, Northwest Farm Credit Services.

Novozymes North America Inc., Ocean Spray Cranberries, Inc., Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Ohio Farmers Union, Ohio Pork Producers Council, Oklahoma Agribusiness Retailers Association, Oklahoma Agricultural Cooperative Council, Oklahoma Farmers Union, Oklahoma Grain & Feed Association, Oklahoma Pork Council, Oklahoma Seed Trade Association, Oklahoma Sorghum Association, Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association, Oregon Association of Nurseries, Oregon Cherry Growers, Inc., Oregon Dairy Farmers Association, Oregon Farmers Union, Oregon Sheep Growers Association, Oregon Small Woodland Association, Oregon Women in Timber, Orion the Hunter's Institute, Panhandle-Plains Land Bank, Partners for Sustainable Pollination, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau, Pennsylvania Farmers Union.

Pennsylvania Forest Products Association, Pheasants Forever, Plains Cotton Cooperative Association, Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Plum Creek Timber Company, Polli-

nator Partnership, Pope and Young Club, Port Blakely Tree Farms, LP, Potlatch Corporation, Prairie Rivers Network, Premier Farm Credit, Puerto Rico Farm Credit, Quality Deer Management, Association, Quail Forever, Rayonier Inc., Red Gold, Inc., Red River Forests, LLC, Red River Valley Sugarbeet Growers Association, Renewable Fuels Association, Resource Management Service, LLC, Rhode Island Sheep Cooperative, Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, Rolling Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Ruffed Grouse Society.

The Rural Broadband Association, Rural Community Assistance Partnership, Select Milk Producers, Inc., Seneca Foods, Shasta Forests Timberlands, LLC, Sidney Sugars, Inc., Sierra Pacific Industries, Society of American Foresters, Soil and Water Conservation Society, Soil Science Society of America, South Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, South Dakota Association of Cooperatives, South Dakota Biotech Association, South Dakota Farmers Union, South Dakota Pork Producers, South Dakota Wheat Growers, South East Dairy Farmers Association, Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association, South Texas Cotton and Grain Association, Southeast Milk Inc., Southern Cotton Growers, Inc., Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative, Southern Peanut Farmers Federation, Southern Rolling Plains Cotton Growers Association of Texas.

Southern States Cooperative, Inc., Southwest Council of Agribusiness, Southwest Georgia Farm Credit, St. Albans Cooperative, Stapleco, State Agriculture and Rural Leaders, Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida, Sustainable Forest Initiative, Sustainable Northwest, Tennessee Clean Water Network, Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation, Tennessee Forestry Association, Tennessee Renewable Energy & Economic Development Council, Texas Ag Finance, Texas Agricultural Cooperative Council, Texas Farmers Union, Texas Forestry Association, Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, Texas Land Bank, Texas Pork Producers Association, Texas Rice Producers Legislative Group, Texas Sheep & Goat Raisers' Association, Timberland Investment Resources, Timber Products Company, The Amalgamated Sugar Company.

The Bank of Commerce, The Nature Conservancy, The Small Woodland Owners Association of Maine, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Trust for Public Land, United Dairymen of Arizona, United FCS, U.S. Animal Health Association, U.S. Beet Sugar Association, U.S. Canola Association, U.S. Cattlemen's Association, U.S. Dry Bean Council, U.S. Pea & Lentil Trade Association, U.S. Rice Producers Association, U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance, USA Dry Pea & Lentil Council, USA Rice Federation, Utah Farmers Union, Utah Wool Growers Association, Virginia Farm Bureau Federation, Virginia Forestry Association, Virginia Grain Producers Association, Virginia Pork Industry Board, Virginia Nursery & Landscape Association, Virginia State Dairymen's Association.

Washington Biotechnology & Biomedical Association, Washington Farm Bureau, Washington Farmers Union, Washington State Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Washington State Dairy Federation, Welch Foods Inc., A Cooperative, Wells Timberland REIT, Western AgCredit, Western Growers, Western Pea & Lentil Growers, Western Peanut Growers Association, Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, Western Sugar Cooperative, Western United Dairymen, The Westervelt Company, Weyerhaeuser Company, Whitetails Unlimited, Inc., Wild Sheep Foundation, Wildlife Forever, Wildlife Management Institute, Wildlife Mississippi, Wis-

consin Agri-Business Association, Wisconsin Farmers Union, Wisconsin Paper Council, Wisconsin Pork Association, Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association, Women Involved in Farm Economics, World Wildlife Fund, Wyoming Sugar Company, Yankee Farm Credit, Yosemite Farm Credit.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am so overjoyed to rise today to be at this point in the farm bill process, where we are on the verge of sitting down with our friends in the other body and beginning to put the final bill together. This has been a long and challenging process for both myself, the ranking member Mr. PETERSON, and all members of the House Agriculture Committee.

We have touched on many subject matters. We have had the most amazing open markups in committee, with amendments almost beyond galore. Twice we have been across the floor of this great body in, essentially, an open process, considering literally 100-plus amendments almost every time it seems.

From that process we are now, with a product, ready to go to conference with the other body. This motion, and the next two sense of Congress resolutions, address several things that were decided on the floor of this House.

While I appreciate mightily the opportunity to reassess the judgments of the body, I would just simply say this, looking at the various points: my good friend the ranking member is exactly right. This motion would restore 1938 and 1949 law as the permanent base farm bill.

Franklin Roosevelt was President, of course, when the 1938 law was signed into place. President Truman signed the 1949 law into place. Those laws were designed at a time when I suspect the average tractor was 55 horsepower. I suppose the average dairy might have been 40 cows.

They were put in place on the assumptions of parity and production controls and allotments and production history, a lot of things that have long since faded away in subsequent farm bills.

I know my friend and a number of groups, in good faith, advocate that we keep that 1938 and 1949 law in place. But I would suggest to my colleagues, the open process we have been through, the open process we are about to have in conference, if we can come up with good language that a majority of both bodies can agree on, that a fellow down at the White House will sign if it is good policy, maybe the conference should be given the option, as is now the case within the farm bill language, of using the 2013 farm bill as base.

The Senate retains the old permanent law from 1938 and 1949. At present, we don't do that in the House draft, so we have got the ability to discuss it. We have got the ability to work on it. I, personally, think that's a good thing.

Now, the other portion of this motion, and this reflects, again, some very serious, sincere differences of

opinion, both in committee and on the floor, about how to address the fundamental nature of the nutrition title. This House decided that the reauthorization should be for 3 years instead of what would be the more traditional concurrent authorization with the rest of the farm bill. I think every Member has to vote their own conscience on that issue.

But, understand: the motion, as structured, would take away the potential option for moving permanent law from the Roosevelt-Truman administration to the present day, and it would also restore that 5-year authorization on nutrition programs, things my colleagues have to take into consideration and factor.

Mr. Speaker, I note to my colleague I am my only speaker on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), one of our subcommittee ranking members.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota, as well as the chair from Oklahoma.

I rise to support this motion to instruct, and let me tell you why.

The farm bill traditionally, around this place, has been one of the most bipartisan efforts that we engage in. Unfortunately, for over the last year, it hasn't seemed that way.

I think that the importance of maintaining the permanent law of 1938 and 1949 is not to suggest that farming today is as it was then. Of course it is not.

But the fact is that it has always provided, in the past efforts, back in 2008, and back in the last three or four decades, the sort of incentive necessary to come together, in a bipartisan fashion, to put together a bill that reflects not just current farming needs throughout this great country of ours today, but also to focus on the necessary importance of the nutrition programs that go to so many of those in our society that are in need.

Now, that brings me to the second point that is reflected in the Senate measure, that is reflected in this motion to instruct, and that is, bifurcating the nutrition programs. It makes absolutely no sense.

There has been a tradition here that I think has worked well in maintaining the incredible amount of cornucopia of food that we produce in this Nation and also never forgetting those in our society who are most in need. That marriage between the nutrition programs, which have benefited from the food that our farmers and ranchers and dairymen produce, and those who need a helping hand has worked well.

So, therefore, why should we separate it?

Why should we have a 3-year nutrition program instead of the 5-year that marries and complements the ongoing farm programs?

So, for all of those reasons, I support this motion to instruct.

And let me finally say, the time has come. The time has come to put away the posturing, go to work, go to conference, and pass a farm bill that reflects America's needs.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), one of our subcommittee ranking members.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the FARRM Act, which is H.R. 2642, reauthorizes Federal farm, rural development, and agricultural trade programs through fiscal year 2018, or 5 years.

However, H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act, which passed last month, reauthorized nutrition programs for only 3 years. This separation is problematic, and it needs to be addressed.

Farming and feeding go hand in hand, and a comprehensive farm bill recognizes this connection. We can restore this connection by ensuring a 5-year reauthorization for all programs that come under the farm bill.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the link between nutrition and farm communities. Support a farm bill that meets the nutritional needs of all Americans.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion and thank the ranking member for his work. Reauthorizing nutrition programs for 5 years is sound policy and the right thing to do.

The farm bill has always been built on a successful coalition of rural and urban communities and Members of Congress who come together in a bipartisan way to create responsible farm and food policy.

By authorizing farm policies for 5 years, but only extending nutrition programs for 3 years, we are leaving millions of working families, seniors, and children with great uncertainty when they need our help the most.

Let's be honest. Changing the authorization for nutrition programs reduces the likelihood of Congress passing a bipartisan farm bill that works for our farmers, food producers, and families. So, too, does repealing permanent farm law, as the current House bill does.

For the last 2 years, Congress has failed to act. Why are we making it even harder to pass a final farm bill?

SNAP helps nearly 47 million Americans, including over 22,000 in my district, afford nutritious food and not go hungry. It has proven to be efficient and effective with error rates at historic lows. It helps Americans at every district across the country by preventing them from falling into poverty and lifting them up through job training and education programs.

I am proud that I was able to include a SNAP employment and training pilot program modeled after a program from my home State of Washington in the nutrition bill that will go to conference.

Even at the height of the recession, 60 percent of those in Washington's programs found employment, and more than half were off assistance in 2 years. This is a commonsense policy to increase education and job training while decreasing the number of people who need SNAP.

This bill has been hijacked long enough. Let's get back to the bipartisan, cooperative process in which the House Agriculture Committee drafted the farm bill. Let's not make things more difficult than they need to be.

We were sent here to do our jobs, to govern and pass policies that will grow our economy, and it is no secret that Congress has been failing at fulfilling this basic responsibility.

So I urge my colleagues to support this motion to authorize both farm and nutrition programs for the full 5 years. Let's get to work and pass a 5-year farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a new member of the committee—well, an old member. He was a member of the Ag Committee back in the 1970s.

□ 1615

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the work that has been done here in this bill. I want to commend Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON for the tireless work that you and your staffs and your subcommittee chairs put into writing this legislation. It is the product of many years and a wealth of experience that has brought consumers and producers together, that has brought urban and rural people together, and that has produced an abundant supply of food for people here in this country and all over the world.

American agriculture is just absolutely one of the wonders of the world. I believe that this motion helps to keep that great success and progress moving forward.

Last but not least, I want to say how refreshing it was to be part of that committee markup. As you know, I was on a 32-year hiatus—the longest in history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. NOLAN. I have been asked time and time again how things are different from the way they were then. Believe me, there are a lot of differences, big and small; but one of the most refreshing things was to be a part of that Ag Committee open, bipartisan, free-wheeling markup, where anybody and everybody got their moment, got an opportunity to offer their resolution, got an opportunity to have a vote on it.

I commend you, Mr. Chairman, for that kind of spirit. That is the kind of spirit that has moved this country and accounted for so much of our great success over the years.

I urge adoption of this motion.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct the conference committee to reauthorize America's nutrition and antihunger programs for 5 years.

At the moment, the majority's farm bill extends crop insurance and other agricultural programs for 5 years, but the nutrition portion only reauthorizes food stamps and other programs for 3 years. This 2-year discrepancy would allow for all kinds of shenanigans the next time these programs are up for debate. We should stop that from happening now.

When this majority severed the nutrition title from the farm bill, they broke a longstanding bipartisan compact on antihunger initiatives that goes back decades, connecting the programs that help farmers produce and the programs that help poor families escape hunger. This arrangement separates farm programs from nutrition programs on a permanent basis. They break the coalition that supports this bill. Quite honestly, it is being done to put food stamps at risk. Indeed, this is a shell game.

The critical antihunger programs have been supported by Republicans and Democrats all across the country—the east coast, the west coast, the heartland—because hunger is not a partisan issue. We all have a vested interest in ending hunger in our country. But with this farm bill, the House Republican majority has betrayed this fight. By cruelly cutting \$40 billion from food stamps, our most important antihunger program, they are telling over 4 million of our most vulnerable citizens—children, seniors, veterans, the disabled—you may not know where your next meal is coming from.

The majority is making this \$40 billion cut, robbing poor families of food, even while continuing to dole out over twice as much—\$90 billion—in crop insurance subsidies, taxpayer dollars, to some of the Nation's wealthiest families and agribusiness.

In the Crop Insurance Program, there are no income eligibility requirements. You can be a billionaire and still collect the subsidy. In the food stamp program, you can only make up to \$23,000. With that, you can only spend almost \$1.50 on a meal. That's the inequity we are talking about here.

There should be a condemnation of what that House majority is trying to do to hunger and nutrition programs—and there is. It has been near universal. Nutrition, agriculture, homeless, seniors, education, and health care organizations—even Republican leaders like former Republican Senator Bob Dole—

all have announced their opposition to this reckless and extreme plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlelady an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Let us understand what the cuts to nutrition programs that the majority is suggesting mean in terms of our children.

Roughly 20 percent of these households that receive the benefits have children under the age of 18; 23 percent have children that are 4 years old and under. The damage that hunger does to children is irreparable. If they go to school hungry, they cannot learn; and if they cannot learn, they cannot succeed.

I only ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to read the data. Read the report in *The Lancet* journal just in the last week or so that tells you what the scientific data is that shows what the impact of hunger is on children's brains and their ability to learn.

We know that the learning period for children is from zero to 3. Why would we want to do irreparable harm to the children in this Nation by cutting off food, of which the United States has a great abundance—and overabundance—and yet we want to cut \$40 billion from the food stamp program? It is reckless and it is extreme.

I just say to my colleagues, if the farm programs are being reauthorized for 5 years, the nutrition programs should be reauthorized for 5 years, just like they have in the past, with that coalition that is coming from all over the country, region by region, Democrats and Republicans, in one unified farm bill. I urge my colleagues to go in that direction.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to follow on the remarks of our colleague from Connecticut.

The SNAP program is in jeopardy, which means children's health is in jeopardy, and we should extend the ARRA-created benefits as well as to fully fund, not cut, the SNAP program.

My colleague referred to the article this past week in *The Lancet*, the prominent medical journal. Allow me to quote from that.

Many studies have shown positive associations between receipt of SNAP . . . and a lower risk of anemia, obesity, poor health, hospital admission for failure to thrive, and reports of child abuse and neglect. Children aged 5–9 years of SNAP-participating families have better academic outcomes and less obesity than children in nonparticipating families.

Between 1961 and 1975, the program was implemented county by county, thus, allowing for comparison across counties that differed only by SNAP availability. In SNAP-available counties there was . . . a significant increase . . . in mean birthweight for both Black and White Americans, compared with those counties where SNAP was not available.

As the Speaker knows, that is an important measure associated with infant health.

Children of low-income women in SNAP-available counties were less likely to have metabolic syndrome [ill health such as diabetes] in adulthood, and women who had received food stamps during early childhood were more likely to be economically self-sufficient.

These are children who had the benefits of SNAP. As adults, they were healthier. This seems, to me, to be a very important point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOLT. The societal benefits of food stamps extend far beyond a temporary reduction of hunger pangs. The benefits last for years—even into the next generation. Why on Earth would we consider reducing support for such an important humane and, yes, economically beneficial program?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would note to my colleagues that many of the points of great merit offered over the course of the discussion of this motion were points debated and discussed on the floor and in committee. I respect the sincerity of all of my colleagues, but we need to remember this motion has two key central points:

Number one, the 1938 and 1949 law remain permanent. We take away the conference's ability to negotiate that point with the United States Senate. Take it away, take it off the table is the goal of this motion to instruct.

The second point, of course, deals with the authorization on SNAP. Should it be 3 years? Should it be 5 years? That is the question you have to decide in this motion. Do you take away the House's ability to have the option of making whatever we can all agree on permanent law? Do you insist that we continue to have the food program, SNAP, run concurrently with the rest of the farm bill? It's a very simple set of issues to consider.

From my own perspective, I would ask the House to allow the conference committee as much flexibility as possible in negotiating with the other body—as much flexibility as possible—and that would require rejecting the motion to instruct.

With that, Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I look forward to the joys of hopefully not quite as challenging a conference as this first 2 years of this process has been but, nonetheless, an acknowledgment that we need to get our work done in a timely fashion and bring a product back that a majority of this body can accept and support.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I just say that we have had a way to deal with this for the last 40-some years

that has worked pretty well. I think it is a big mistake, as most groups that are involved in the farm bill feel it is a mistake, to eliminate permanent law and to have a situation where one part of the bill is authorized for a different length of time than the other. People that have been involved in this for a long time think this is a mistake. I think it is a mistake.

I ask my colleagues to support this motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1630

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 378

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642 (an Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes) should advance provisions to repeal the Administration of Tariff Rate Quotas language as added by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, and thus restore the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to manage supplies of sugar throughout the marketing year to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the resolution and call on the House to support reforming the sugar program in upcoming negotiations on the farm bill.

Just a few months ago, I offered a reform amendment to the farm bill that gained unprecedented support and which made modest, but essential, reforms to our government's sugar program. Today, we debate this resolution, one that is even more modest but just as critical to bringing stability and balance to our sugar market. As a matter of fact, my resolution is even more timely. Following our debate on this program, the government began shoveling out money to support sugar growers—\$250 million worth in 4 months. We were told by the opposing side that it operated at no cost. We need to address this wasteful practice.

Mr. Speaker, every single one of us has a small food business in his district. Sugar is an essential ingredient even in many foods that aren't necessarily sweet. We all know how hard it is on small businesses right now. We know how critical these jobs are to our economy. Shouldn't we do everything we can to help them grow strong?

Today, millions of American families are on tight budgets. They watch their spending carefully, especially when it comes to buying food; and when they walk down the grocery aisle, they may not realize the costs that go into the products that they buy for themselves and their children. Very few of them know that they are paying significantly more for these products in order to ensure the profits of a small handful of sugar producers. They don't realize that, altogether, Americans are paying an additional \$3.5 billion a year because of a government sugar program that makes little sense.

Tens of millions of Americans are looking for jobs. Many don't understand why there isn't more work available right now. What they don't know is that a nationwide industry is suffering because we have a sugar program that favors the few over the many. There are more than 600,000 jobs in sugar-using industries today. However, that industry has seen tough times. More than 127,000 jobs have been lost since the late 1990s. The Department of Commerce estimates that, for every one job the sugar program saves, three are lost in sugar-using industries. The sugar program is a bad deal for businesses, for consumers, for job seekers, and for taxpayers. When the House passed a farm bill this summer, every single commodity program was reformed except for one—the sugar program.

The sugar program is probably more in need of reform than any other commodity. The program controls prices to ensure that at all times sugar farmers and producers profit. When prices are high, as they were for 4 out of the last 5 years, producers do very well. When prices are low, the government buys

sugar and makes sure that farmers and producers make their money back. This isn't a functioning sugar market. It is a nonstop bailout.

Meanwhile, the world price for sugar is typically much lower than here in the United States, and this is a big advantage for foreign competitors. In fact, Canada even advertises their access to the world sugar market as a reason for American companies to relocate or to build new facilities in their nation. Mexican food companies also have lower and more stable prices and the advantages of importing products to the U.S. under NAFTA. Simply put, we are handicapping our food industries at a time when they face intense competition. Good jobs are flowing out of the U.S. into other nations.

In the farm bill we sent over to the Senate, every single commodity program was reformed except for sugar. Dairy farmers, peanut growers, cotton growers, and many more will all see changes to their programs. The resolution on the House floor today proposes a modest change to the sugar program.

Currently, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to manage imports of sugar for 6 months out of the year. The other 6 months of the year, he can do nothing even if prices spike unreasonably high. The Secretary basically has to make an educated guess about how much sugar should be imported. The way the statute is written, the Secretary must err on the side of the growers and producers. This means that, if the guess is wrong, Big Sugar benefits and consumers get fleeced.

It is time that we put an end to a policy that makes little sense—a policy that didn't even exist until the 2008 farm bill. This is a failed experiment that has hurt lots of people and has helped only a handful.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that this resolution is on the floor today. I believe that the House should make a strong statement—that our conferees should work to get good reform to the sugar program in this year's farm bill. I am also grateful for the bipartisan support for this measure. At a time when it seems like Democrats and Republicans can't agree on much, we have a very strong bipartisan group working across the aisle to stand up for consumers, for job seekers, for businesses, and for taxpayers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to oppose this resolution and to say that we have very strong bipartisan opposition to this resolution. Frankly, I don't know why we are doing this, because we settled this issue when we had the debate on the floor earlier in June. This is a sense of the Congress, and there is no requirement that the conference committee pay any attention to this, so I don't quite understand why we are going through this process; but in any event, we are here.

We have a sugar policy that supports \$20 billion in economic activity and 142,000 jobs. The reason we have it is that every country in the world that produces sugar subsidizes those industries or supports them, in most cases substantially more than does the United States. So if we change this program or give up what we have put together here, what you are going to do is give this industry away to countries that subsidize and support their industries more than we are doing here in the United States. I don't know why we would want to do that, but that would be the effect of this.

The Government of Mexico owns 20 percent of the industry in its country; and with NAFTA, we gave Mexico open access to our market. This is in spite of the fact that they own the industry down there. President Reagan once said that unilateral disarmament has never worked, that it only encourages aggressors. Reagan had it right. So whether it is defense policy or economic policy, you don't give something away for nothing to people who are doing more than what our opponents claim we are doing.

The United States is the largest sugar importer in the world. We bring in 1.5 million tons of sugar from 40 countries. Nobody else does that. This is sugar we could make here in the United States, but we gave away 15 percent of our market to help other countries. We have been doing that for a long time, and we have had pretty good prices. All of a sudden, because Mexico had a good crop, I guess, the prices have collapsed. If you think that the loan rate—the bottom price that we have in the sugar program—is giving us some kind of a profit or some kind of a “fat cat” deal, I invite you to come up to American Crystal's annual meeting in December in my area and in Representative CRAMER's area, at which they are going to be reporting that they have lost money this year because the sugar prices are at loan rates. So the loan rates that are in the bill are not guaranteeing anybody a profit. They are just putting a floor under it, trying to keep us in business until next year.

There is no good reason to be doing this. We settled this issue before. The reason for the April 1 date is that, in the past, the USDA has made mistakes in terms of where we were with the market. So by having an April 1 date, we can make it less likely that these mistakes are going to happen in the future. That is the main reason that we have got it in there.

The sugar program has operated at no cost for a long time. During that time, the opponents claim that the prices were too high. Now the prices have collapsed, and they are saying the safety net costs too much. So they are still complaining about the prices being too high. I will guarantee you that you could get the price down to almost nothing, and it wouldn't change the price that people charge for candy

bars. You could probably give it away, and they wouldn't lower the price.

This has been a good policy. It keeps sugar stable. There was a time in this country when we got rid of the sugar program. What happened? We had prices go up to 50 cents a pound, and we had the candy companies and the sugar users come in and ask for the government program to be put back in place so they could get the prices down to a more affordable level. I will guarantee you, if you get rid of the sugar policy, what you are going to have is a feast or famine situation. You might have low prices for a while, but you are going to have a time when high prices are going to do a lot more harm to you than this sugar program does.

This is a bad idea. It doesn't need to be done, as we have already settled this issue. I ask my colleagues to reject this for any number of reasons.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, DANNY DAVIS, the cochair of the Sugar Reform Caucus.

□ 1645

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been very pleased to work in a very bipartisan way with Representatives PITTS, GOODLATTE, BLUMENAUER, and others as we have shaped H. Res. 378.

The domestic sugar program is an outdated system of strict government controls that cost consumers \$4 billion a year in higher prices. Historically, the sugar program not only hurts consumers but it also costs us jobs. High sugar prices were responsible for the loss of 112,000 jobs in sugar-using industries in the last decade. While growers of all commodities, including those for cotton, rice, peanuts, corn, soybeans, and wheat, have seen their benefits cut and their programs reformed, for some inexplicable reason sugar growers and processors continue to get a free ride and keep their program without any reform.

No other crop has a program like sugar, which restricts both domestic production and imports. Peanut and tobacco growers once had a quota that limited production, but Congress reformed those programs a long time ago.

Now we are only left with the sugar program, where it remains permanently in the 2013 farm bill to continue to cause higher consumer prices for food products containing sugar. This program is designed to benefit a few at a tremendous cost to many. Our current sugar policy offloads the program's cost onto consumers and food companies, entices U.S. companies to relocate overseas, destroys U.S. jobs, and limits export market opportunities for the rest of the economy.

It is time for Congress to finally reform this relic of a program of the past and put an end to sugar's special status. We can now correct a specific aspect of the 2013 farm bill by supporting H. Res. 378.

The 2008 farm bill directs the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture to manage the overall U.S. sugar supply, including imports, so that market prices on average can stay higher in the United States compared to the overall world price of sugar. We need to eliminate this same provision in the 2013 farm bill that would limit the Secretary of Agriculture's ability to allow sufficient sugar imports into the country so that consumers can pay their prices.

All that we are asking is to give the Secretary of Agriculture some flexibility to adjust.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the relevant subcommittee in the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Pitts-Goodlatte amendment for a number of reasons.

First of all, we have already voted on the Pitts-Goodlatte amendment provisions during the farm bill, and the House voted to reject it. I am not sure why we are here again today to retread all of these issues. Even if this resolution were to pass—which hopefully it doesn't—I hope our Members remember how they voted in July and understand why they voted the way they did in July and stick with that this week. But because the provisions in both bills in the House and Senate are the same this has even less effect than for the conferees to ignore it.

Our trade laws allow a lot of sugar to be imported in this country. We can and do grant extra access above and beyond the commitments if, in fact, we do need more.

But the farm bill simply says, let's wait to see how much Mexico is going to send us before we grant others extra access. Remember that Mexico has 100 percent access to our market. They heavily subsidize their sugar, and the Mexican government owns 20 percent of that industry.

The Pitts resolution would ignore market forecasts and start granting extra access to Mexico and other countries right off the bat before the growing season. Mr. Speaker, that is reckless. The effect of this would glut our market with foreign subsidized sugar, depress our prices, and make it impossible for our farmers to repay our loans, resulting in forfeitures and additional taxpayer costs that shouldn't be there. How good is that for taxpayers?

Sugar farmers are currently experiencing a 57 percent drop in sugar prices. I would argue that not one consumer in this America has benefited from that drop. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle argue that sugar costs way too much money. Yet with a 57 percent drop, where are those savings going to those consumers that you

want to protect? Where are those reduced soda prices? Where are those reduced candy bar prices? It is nowhere to be seen.

I would argue that the policy works when prices are high, at above the levels. There is no cost to taxpayers. Then when prices are depressed, like they are now because of extra access from rural markets which are all subsidized, then prices are depressed and the safety net steps in. You either have a safety net or you don't. The argument that this one was not adjusted in this farm bill is specious on its face.

Simply to say we change it for the sake of change makes no sense. If there is a legitimate change that you want, fine. But that is not what these folks are proposing. They are saying change it just because everybody else got changed. This program worked for 10 years without any cost to the taxpayer directly, and it would continue to work that way going into the future.

They picked a great year to pick this price because prices are down. The safety net is supposed to kick in. I would argue that we need to maintain the sugar program because it works for American sugar producers.

Confectioners cannot argue that prices in Canada are less. Prices in Canada right now are 29 cents a pound. So where are all those jobs coming back to the United States because sugar in America is 26 cents a pound? Where are the jobs that went to Mexico because sugar was cheaper there? Oh, it is not cheaper; it is 28 cents a pound there. Where are all those jobs coming back?

You cannot argue with a straight face that sugar prices drive all those jobs out of this country.

Reject the Pitts amendment, and let's move forward with a farm bill that we can make for American farmers.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Illinois for their leadership on this issue.

A few months ago, we offered a reform amendment to the House farm bill that would have saved taxpayers money, kept American jobs at home, and ended special treatment to one farm commodity at the expense of all others.

This farm bill makes major policy changes that leave no commodity untouched, except one. The farm bill makes absolutely no change to the sugar program. In fact, the sugar program wasn't even given the scrutiny of a hearing as the Ag Committee was constructing the current farm bill.

Since 2008, manufacturers across the country have been struggling to run

their operations due to the uncertainty created by the sugar program. In fact, for every job that proponents of this horrendous policy claim is maintained by the current sugar program, the Commerce Department estimates that the sugar program eliminated three jobs in food manufacturing.

Although I wish we could be here debating even greater reform, what we are debating today is quite modest.

This motion to instruct simply restores to the Secretary of Agriculture the flexibility to manage sugar imports, an authority the Secretary had prior to the 2008 farm bill. To be clear, this language will not allow a pound—a pound—more sugar to enter the U.S. unless the Secretary authorizes that it can come in upon a finding that is needed.

Many of you may be wondering why we are discussing sugar again. Since the House last debated the farm bill, the negative effects of the sugar program have only gotten worse. While proponents of the current sugar program claim it is "no cost," nothing could be further from the truth. The sugar program has cost American taxpayers more than \$250 million since July.

To put this in perspective, in less than 3 months this broken policy has cost American taxpayers \$250 million, which is almost as much as the amount of money available for an entire year for The Emergency Food Assistance Program, TEFAP, the USDA program that purchases commodities for food banks. It is nearly \$50 million more than the Commodity Supplemental Food Program for our Nation's senior citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Comedian Jay Leno recently joked—"The Department of Agriculture wants to use our tax money to buy 400,000 tons of sugar to limit supply and boost prices so sugar producers can pay back government loans that they could default on. You follow me here on this? We loaned them money and now we're giving them more money so they can pay back our loan. You still wonder why we're 16 trillion dollars in debt?"

Sadly, this is no longer a joke. This is the reality of the sugar program and it is the American taxpayer who is saddled with the cost of this program.

Since this government shutdown began we have been intensely debating the spending priorities for our country. I don't know how we can justify this horrendous program at all!

While I wish we were able to go further in reforming the sugar program, today we have the opportunity to return a small bit of sanity to the program.

Please join me in supporting the Pitts sugar reform resolution to restore common sense to America's sugar policy.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that for the 12 years before July there has been no cost at all, and the food stamp part of the farm bill had no hearings either.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I am here today on behalf of our farmers in Minnesota and the midwest.

My State is number one in sugar beet production. That means my State's economy and the State's rural economy take a direct hit because of this resolution. This resolution hurts our farmers, small businesses, hospitals, schools, the lives of real people in rural communities.

American-grown sugar creates more than 142,000 jobs in 22 States and nearly \$20 billion in annual economic activity. We have farmers in the beet fields right now finishing up harvesting. This resolution sends a message that this House wants to shut down sugar production, which will shut down jobs here at home.

But some jobs will be created—in Brazil. Let's defend U.S. jobs, defeat this resolution, and stand with sugar beet farmers in Minnesota and across the United States.

The Republican majority has shut down the Federal Government. I am not going to stand by and shut down the sugar program. So let's protect U.S. communities and U.S. jobs and vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California, JACKIE SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is kind of uncomfortable being on this side of the aisle, but it is also, I guess, a recognition that this is truly a bipartisan effort, and I am really thrilled to be joining in it.

Imagine that when the farm bill was debated here, every single commodity program in the farm bill was amended, was reformed, with the exception of sugar. Now, why would that happen? Well, maybe it is because of some sweet-talking sugar lobbyists that made that happen.

But nonetheless, let's be clear about what this resolution doesn't do. It does not undermine the sugar program in this country. The sugar program that exists in terms of price support remains, the domestic marketing allotment for sugar remains, and it does not eliminate sugar import quotas.

What does it do? It basically says that the Secretary of Agriculture can make sure during the entire year, and not just 6 months, that the market supply is appropriate.

What do we know about research that has been done on the cost to consumers? It is said to cost consumers \$3.5 billion. Now, this figure doesn't come from the candy manufacturers; this figure comes from a number of studies by the Government Accountability Office, by OECD, by the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Now, what has happened since July? Since July, the taxpayers of this country have spent \$250 million because they are guaranteed as sugar producers to 17 cents per pound. When they couldn't get 17 cents per pound, the U.S. had to buy the sugar and then try to sell it to ethanol producers.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to reform the system.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Texas, Judge POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our current U.S. sugar policy maintains that sugar will not become a solely foreign-grown product for the United States. When we weaken our sugar and our sugar growers, it hurts America but it helps Brazil, it helps Mexico—the biggest competitors for the United States.

Brazil's yearly \$2.5 billion subsidy has led them to controlling 50 percent of the global sugar exports.

Mexico has already unlimited access to the United States. And who is the biggest sugar producer and exporter in Mexico? The Mexican government. Mexico owns and operates 20 percent of the Mexican sugar industry. On top of that, Mexico already owes Texas 300,000 acre feet of water out of the Rio Grande. It is improperly taking that water out of the Rio Grande River—water that should go to Texas sugar growers, but it is not.

House Resolution 378 will weaken the U.S. sugar industry, giving advantage to Mexico and Brazil. By allowing more foreign sugar into the United States we create unnecessary and hurtful competition. We prefer, if we pass this legislation, foreign farmers over American farmers.

□ 1700

Weakening our sugar program is not reform; it is crippling. It is crippling to the United States market, to the 140,000 sugar industry jobs. Once again, it only leaves us dependent on other countries for our sugar.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to become dependent on foreign countries for our energy; it is another thing if we start moving into the area of becoming dependent on foreign countries for what we eat. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), a leader in sugar reform.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about this issue, as are many of my colleagues. I strongly support this resolution by Messrs. PITTS, DAVIS, GOODLATTE, and others for a whole host of reasons, but let's be very clear about a few things here.

This country consumes more sugar than it produces. We must import sugar, whether we like it or not. We also have to deal with some other very basic facts.

I listened with intensity to the gentleman from Minnesota, a good friend, who talked about American Crystal losing money. Well, the answer is not to bail them out with our tax dollars. We have seen enough of that around here. It is time to stop those types of unnecessary bailouts.

We also heard my good friend from Texas, who, I was relieved today, did

not complain about sugar companies making money or confectioners making money, as if profits are something that is evil. We want these companies to make money. We have had 4 years of high sugar prices, and that simply incentivizes more Mexican imports. It provides more incentives for those imports.

But let's look at the numbers. The current program is a remnant of the Depression era. It puts 600,000 American jobs in the food industry at risk. Between 1997 and 2011, nearly 127,000 jobs were lost in segments of the food and beverage industries that use sugar in their operations. And, yes, Hershey is located in my district.

The current sugar program hits American consumers and businesses with \$3.5 billion of extra costs every year. The CBO projects that the Sugar-to-Ethanol Program, known as the Feedstock Flexibility Program, will cost taxpayers \$239 million over the next several years, including \$51 million this year alone. Some analysts project costs of up to \$100 million this year and \$250 million over the next 2 years combined.

When sugar prices drop below a certain level, the Federal Government buys that sugar and then sells it at a loss to the ethanol producers. The taxpayers are abused twice. When is enough enough? It is unacceptable and wrong to call on the American people to support the current sugar program, not only with their hard-earned consumer dollars, but with their tax dollars as well.

Yes, we are having debates around this place right now about the government shutdown and the debt ceiling. The point is we need to get on with this. Let's protect the American people, show them we can do our jobs. I ask my colleagues to reform, not repeal, the current sugar program, but reform it. Let's save the American consumers money in the midst of this tough economy. Let's show the American people we can act responsibly on their behalf.

I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to correct the RECORD. We do not need to import. The farmers in my district could easily produce that 15 percent. We gave those markets to these countries out of the goodness of our heart.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the ranking member, and thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. Again, it is nothing but an attack on thousands of family farms in this country and in my district.

If it were the sense of Congress that it was right to end the successful sugar program, the House would have done that last June. Instead, we did the opposite. We defeated this same attack, clearly indicating that this program should be preserved.

The district that I represent is home to Michigan Sugar. And I hear these references—I heard them on the floor earlier, and I just saw it again—to Big Sugar. These are family farms that have banded together in cooperatives. You can call that Big Sugar if you want. It is a term I suppose that is intended to elicit certain thoughts about who these farmers are. That is a shame. These are family farmers who work hard every day and are forced to be in competition with multinational corporations.

We talk about the price of sugar. The price of sugar in a candy bar in 1985, there was 3 cents of sugar in that candy bar and it cost 35 cents. Today, that same candy bar is \$1.39, and there is 3 cents of sugar in that candy bar.

Let's deal with the facts here. This is a struggle between companies that want to marginally increase their profit because not enough profits are going to these companies. They are among the highest, most profitable companies in the country, and they should be. That is good. But when is enough enough? Why is it that the family farmers are always the ones that are asked to give more, to potentially risk their livelihood, generations of livelihood?

This is wrong. It was wrong when we defeated it in June, and it is wrong again today.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), another leader in sugar reform in our Nation.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I don't want to get into the crosshairs of my friend from Minnesota, and if I had sugar beet farmers in my district, I suppose I might have a different position; but I would like to talk about jobs because that is why I support restoring the Secretary of Agriculture's ability to keep sugar prices at a reasonable level year-round, not just during the arbitrary 6-month period dictated by the 2008 farm bill.

Between 1997 and 2011, nearly 127,000 jobs were lost in segments of the food and beverage industry that use sugar in the products they make, while employment actually rose in food industry segments that don't use sugar. Today, there are an estimated 600,000 Americans directly employed in the food manufacturing industry. It is an enormously important industry. The U.S. Department of Commerce says that for every one sugar production job saved, our current sugar program eliminates three jobs in food manufacturing. That is a loss of manufacturing jobs at a rate of 100,000 per year.

And the fiscal impacts of our sugar policies are just as disturbing. Since this issue was debated on the House floor only 6 weeks ago, the sugar program has cost the taxpayer \$90 million. And I am informed that the total cost to the taxpayer this year alone will exceed \$150 million. The Congressional Budget Office projects another \$239 million in the outyears of the bill.

We don't need to be hitting up the taxpayer for this money. We can make modest reforms to U.S. sugar policy while still leaving a safety net in place for U.S. sugar farmers and processors. This motion strikes the right balance. It is modest and commonsense policy. It is scaled back to include just one of the reforms that the House considered 2 months ago.

Madam Speaker, I think this should be supported. It is a modest, important reform. I think it is appropriate in light of the context of our farm policy. We are making reforms in other areas, and this is one area where we really do need to reform on behalf of the American consumer and on behalf of the need for more manufacturing jobs in the United States of America.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot of things today. We have heard from those of us who think that it is a good program, that it has been efficient, and that it hasn't cost the taxpayers money for the last 10 years; and we have heard from the other side that it is not efficient. We have heard conflicting numbers of jobs, about potentially what jobs may have been lost. But what is not debatable are the jobs that are created by the sugar industry, including 142,000 nationally and 12,000 jobs just in Florida alone.

We are going to continue to hear conflicting sides here, but let me tell you what is not really debatable. What is not really debatable is that this is an industry that, around the entire planet, is subsidized. And what we are talking about here is a unilateral disarmament of the U.S. industry that creates, again, 142,000 jobs.

I keep hearing, also, the fact that consumers here are struggling. Wait a second. Sugar here for consumers is among the lowest prices on the entire planet.

And then I have heard, again, that it is affecting the food manufacturing industry. By the way, now we are getting to the real substance of the issue. But let's ask the question: prices of sugar have dropped dramatically this year. Have you seen a dramatic shift, the lowering of prices in the food manufacturing industry? By the way, let me not get that dramatic. Have you seen a dramatic lowering of prices of diet sodas versus ones that contain sugar? No.

Look, if that was the case, if the price reductions were going to be passed on to the consumers, then you would see, obviously, products that don't contain sugar would be a lot less expensive than the ones that do contain sugar.

Again, we are going to hear a lot of conflicting issues, but let's not forget the basic principle here: We have thousands of jobs that depend on this industry, including in Florida. We have,

again, some large manufacturers that want lower prices, and I don't blame them. But please don't say they are going to pass them on to the consumer, because they never have. Just look at the price of Diet Coke versus regular Coke.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I spoke earlier on the floor today, and I think it is wonderful that we are having this great debate in this great Chamber. Obviously, this is a bipartisan issue, and I am so glad that some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle have joined me in this great debate for sugar reform.

I represent the great Third District of Tennessee, and I have spent a lot of time in my district in manufacturing plants where I believe, and I would argue, that we manufacture the best baked goods in the country, some of the finest candies in the country, and we distribute these goods all over our great Nation. We use sugar. We use a lot of sugar.

But as we have been involved in this great debate and since the last time on the farm bill, I have noticed a couple of things. It is just not working. Since we had that last vote, it has cost the American taxpayer over \$250 million. In addition to that, I have made a commitment to the workers in these plants that I am going to fight hard to keep their jobs in the United States of America, in particular in the great Third District of Tennessee. In order to do that, we have to stop this madness. This is not a radical change to sugar reform. It is a modest proposal that allows the Secretary of Agriculture the discretion to help the American consumer against skyrocketing costs and potential skyrocketing costs in the price of sugar.

Let's face it; sugar is a commodity, plain and simple. And if you use it and the price goes up, and if it is kept artificially high, it drives the price up and you become uncompetitive. I believe in the free market. I fervently argue for the free market, but the Pitts-Goodlatte amendment does a couple of things. It protects American consumers; it protects American jobs; and it is the right side of the argument for good, free-market Americans.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRA- DER).

Mr. SCHRA DER. Madam Speaker, I think it is important to put all this in perspective. U.S. sugar policy from the 2008 farm bill has been very, very successful. As a matter of fact, the committees of jurisdiction both on the House and Senate side decided not to alter the sugar provisions in the 2013 farm bills passed by both the House and the Senate. As a matter of fact, this has been argued, as we have heard, again and again. This amendment and

amendments similar to this have been rejected each time.

This would be a very damaging amendment at a time when American farmers are already hurting. This is exactly the inappropriate time to go after American jobs. These guys would end up going bankrupt, and I don't think you want to sacrifice existing American jobs with the hope that some new jobs might be created.

The other thing that is missing here is the acknowledgment that the Secretary of Agriculture already has the authority to increase U.S. sugar imports if there is an emergency. So why do we need this instruction? I don't get it.

The other point, if we are going to get back to some semblance of regular order in the conference process, since the House and Senate farm bills are identical here, this should not even be conferenceable at the end of the day. I think it is out of order and inappropriate.

Right now, Mexico, as has been stated, is well subsidized. Twenty percent of their production is outright subsidized, owned by their government, is driving sugar prices in the tank for Americans. That is not right. This should be WTO conferenceable at the end of the day.

This is the wrong time to go about trying to end a policy that has worked great for the last 12 years and finally is paying off for those sugar producers, sugar farmers, and all the sugar beet seed growers in my district that need a little help in this tough, tough time. I think if you are in favor of supporting a good balance of trade, supporting American agriculture, supporting the American taxpayer, at the end of the day, you do not want to vote in favor of Pitts amendment. I urge its defeat.

□ 1715

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Pitts amendment on the House resolution on the farm bill.

The sugar program included in the 2008 farm bill that became permanent in the 2013 House farm bill, contains a harmful restraint on trade and sugar between the 6 months of October and April, which makes it so that the Secretary of Agriculture cannot allow an increase in sugar imports, even if the marketplace needs it.

This detrimental restriction led to record-high prices for both the sugar producers and consumers alike. The higher costs resulted in many manufacturing companies, some are located in my district, struggling or having to even shut down because they are unable to sustain these high costs, killing good manufacturing jobs in the process.

This resolution ensures that the U.S. will not be forced to face higher sugar prices that are two times the world

price because of an erroneous restriction in the current law. These high sugar prices have unfairly cost consumers \$3.5 billion a year.

Simply, the U.S. should be able to control these costs and adjust accordingly so that we do not impose unjust costs upon our consumers, especially in these economically trying times.

The bottom line is this: the problem is not Mexico. The problem is an outdated anti-taxpayer, anti-consumer, anti-business sugar-reform program. The Pitts resolution will help restore some balance to the program and remove artificial pressure from the current government intrusion into the marketplace, which is what we are looking for here.

What will the Pitts resolution do? It will help fix our broken sugar program by, one, allowing sugar farmers to retain their commodity program; two, to help ensure taxpayers will be less likely to have to pick up the tab for this program; and, three, help to ensure that hundreds of thousands of good manufacturing jobs and sugar industries will be less threatened.

I urge support of the Pitts resolution. It is a commonsense approach.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH).

Mr. YOH. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota.

I oppose the gentleman from Pennsylvania's resolution, H. Res. 378.

Sugar is the only commodity where the U.S. is a net importer. This puts U.S. producers at a disadvantage. Our sugar farmers have to compete with sugar-producing governments and countries that heavily subsidize their farmers' production. Yes, this year this program did cost our government, but it is because Mexico is allowed to dump their sugar on our market because of NAFTA. This is a trade issue that we need to look at deeper.

U.S. farmers would gladly give up their safety net as long as every other country discontinued their heavily subsidized programs as well. U.S. sugar farmers can compete with any other foreign sugar farmer and we can outperform them, but they can't compete against a foreign government and subsidies. At the end of the day, this is a jobs issue. There are over 142,000 jobs in the domestic sugar industry, with over 12,000 in Florida alone. Many of these jobs would move to Brazil or Mexico if the intent of this resolution becomes law. There again, another industry would be weakened by our government policies.

We in government should work to keep America stronger and more competitive, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 378.

The current U.S. sugar program is uncompetitive, outdated, it stunts American job creation, harms U.S. confectioners, and forces food manufacturers and families to pay a higher cost for any product made with sugar. Recent data suggests that without reform, the program puts 600,000 jobs in the sugar-using industries at risk. I am all too aware of these negative economic impacts during a recent visit to a leading confectioner in my district.

Headquartered in Bryan, Ohio, Spangler Candy Company is a family-owned business that has been providing consumers with Dum Dums, Saf-T-Pops, Circus Peanuts, candy canes, and other confections since 1906. This company currently has over 400 U.S. employees; but if it could purchase sugar at world-market prices instead of U.S. prices, that number would be closer to 600. That's a difference of 200 highly skilled manufacturing jobs in a single small midwestern town. Imagine the positive economic growth that would result from sugar reform nationwide.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. Reforming the U.S. sugar program will restore fairness in the sugar market, encourage U.S. investment, and spur job creation in our local communities.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Speaker, listening to the debate here this afternoon, I am reminded of a statement from an old University of Minnesota law professor who once said that "all political decisions revolve around who you're for." And I've heard both sides of this issue castigating one side or the other; but it becomes rather clear, as you listen to this debate, that the supporters of this resolution are in support of those multinational corporations and foreign corporations and foreign governments that stand to benefit from a change in our U.S. sugar policy.

On the other side, the side that I choose to stand with, we have the producers such as the cane growers, the beet growers who put their crops in the field at risk every year, the men and women who work in the fields, who work in the plants processing sugar, and the consumers who benefit from a stable supply of reasonably priced sugar to satisfy our food needs here in this country.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge that we defeat this resolution and stick with the sugar program that has worked so well in this country for so long. In Minnesota alone, we have 32,500 people working in that industry. There are 142,000 people working throughout the country in this industry.

Madam Speaker, this was a jobs bill. This was an American manufacturing and production bill. Let's defeat this resolution. Let's support the farmers. Let's support the workers. Let's support the consumers. Let's defeat this amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I ask for support of my colleagues on a resolution in support of making a simple correction to the House-passed farm bill during the conference with the Senate.

The 2008 farm bill overreached in limiting the USDA's ability to allow sugar imports if there is a shortage in domestic supply. This misguided policy has resulted in extreme shortages and now surpluses, adding unnecessary volatility to the marketplace and creating uncertainty for our manufacturers. Because of these policies, we have been losing food manufacturing jobs at the rate of almost 10,000 per year. We cannot afford these job losses.

The district I represent in Illinois is home to a number of food manufacturers, including Jelly Belly, TruSweets Confectionery, Cornfields, Ford Gum, and Long Grove Confectionery. These companies employ hundreds of people and support hundreds of families in the 10th District. These are economic drivers of our community.

In addition to costing our manufacturers and workers, this policy is costing taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Since July, this policy is estimated to have cost more than \$250 million. Keep in mind that we were told this program would operate at zero cost.

The reform called for by this resolution would make a modest change to U.S. sugar policy while still maintaining a safety net for U.S. sugar farmers and processors.

Please join me in supporting this commonsense resolution. Express support for this reasonable reform.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), my good friend and the clean-up hitter on our side.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member and my neighbor for yielding the time and for his leadership on this very important issue that supports the sugar farmers of the Red River Valley of the north, and I am very pleased to confirm that there is, in fact, plenty of room for all of our colleagues to attend American Crystal Sugar's annual meeting; so I appreciate his invitation, as well.

How many Federal programs only cost money every 10 to 12 years? We hear that this program has cost \$250 million since July. Yeah, since July of 2002. That's all it has cost.

I want to speak less, perhaps, to the merits of the program because they have already been so eloquently illustrated and speak more to an issue of unity. At a time when unity is so rare, it is unfortunate that some of our colleagues have chosen to attempt to dismantle one of the very few, frankly,

successful achievements of this Congress.

The committee work on the 2013 farm bill began years ago before many of us were even elected to Congress. An anti-sugar amendment was thoughtfully debated on this floor, including the provisions in this resolution, and the House killed it. At that time, a sense of the House was reached and a farm bill was passed.

The Senate passed the exact same language pertaining to the sugar program that is making today's action not only divisive, but a total waste of time, as House rules prohibit the conferees from even considering its language. This maneuver undermines the very integrity of this great institution, and it ignores the unifying achievement of this farm bill by dismantling the support system for our sugar farmers who are facing a 57 percent collapse in prices as we speak.

We don't need more division, Madam Speaker. We need accomplishments. Let's not impose division where there is unity. Let's vote "no" on this amendment. Let's allow our conferees to do their jobs, bring back a report that a majority of us can vote for and a farm bill that we can all vote for, that the Senate can agree to, that the President can sign, and demonstrate our functionality once again.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 378.

The current sugar policy in this country is outdated and this year will cost American taxpayers millions upon millions of dollars. It is time for us to recognize that there is a global supply of sugar that American manufacturers need to be able to access, and the world price for sugar futures consistently trades lower than domestic futures. If it weren't bad enough that our policy causes food prices to be artificially high, this year taxpayers will pick up the bill to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars when the USDA purchases the excess supply. We will be converting our excess sugar into ethanol to support an industry which does not need any more taxpayer help. In fact, that is another discussion for another day of bad policy.

At a time when we are all taking a hard look at every dollar we spend, we need to take a hard look at this sugar program. Every Member of Congress should ask themselves: Is this the best way we can use limited taxpayer dollars?

Taxpayers are paying for the current sugar program when they write their

checks to the IRS, and they are paying for it when they write their checks to the local grocery store. We need to support this resolution, Madam Speaker.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

□ 1730

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to talk about the importance of this resolution.

Prior to coming to Congress, I spent a decade working in economic development in Tacoma, Washington; and during that time, it was my job to go and meet with employers and find out how to keep jobs and try to grow jobs in our area.

One of the first meetings I had was with a company called Brown and Haley, a confectioner that has been producing the legendary and, if I might add, delicious Almond Roca since 1923. In discussing the economic challenges facing that company, the number one issue that they raised was the competitive disadvantage they faced from the high cost of sugar.

We are a northern border State. From where I grew up, on a clear day you could see Canada. For a region that is struggling to grow jobs and keep jobs, the threat of businesses in my district moving across the border isn't a theoretical policy conversation; it is a real threat.

The current program puts 600,000 American manufacturing jobs at risk in all 50 States. Since the 2008 farm bill, the U.S. cost of sugar has skyrocketed to almost two times the world price. That price increase is passed directly on to our confectioners, who have to make tough operating adjustments to sustain their business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KILMER. Our neighbors realize how expensive U.S. sugar is and how high the prices are; and in the case of Brown and Haley in my district, those north of the border have already explicitly approached and advertised the cheaper sugar prices across the border.

This current sugar program doesn't just affect large corporations. It impacts small family-owned businesses like Brown and Haley in Tacoma, Washington, that have been in our communities for generations. So I ask for support for this resolution to help American small businesses and American manufacturing jobs.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I call on my colleagues this afternoon to support this resolution, to further reform a harmful and unnecessary sugar program that puts 600,000 American manufacturing jobs at risk.

Back home in Indiana's Third Congressional District, companies like Aunt Millie's, small candy maker Plyleys Candies in Lagrange, Indiana, and Edy's Ice Cream in Fort Wayne are forced to pay artificially inflated prices, thanks to Washington's top-down control. This kind of price-fixing should be a bygone relic of the Soviet era and has no place in free-market policies. Today we have an opportunity to make commonsense reforms to help protect these jobs.

I would also like to urge this body to protect the victory for limited government when the House split the farm bill and ended the unholy alliance between food stamps and agricultural policy. These policies are completely different and must be considered separately, just like we are doing now in debating sugar policy.

For the first time in 40 years, we gave taxpayers an honest look at how Washington spends their money. We took a commonsense approach and considered food stamp policy and traditional ag policy separately.

Today the House sent to conference a bill that keeps these policies separate. We can make sure that, going forward, we keep our commitment to transparency and limited government.

I urge the conference committee to adopt this resolution, protect these jobs, and keep food and farm policies separate.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, in closing, I would just reiterate that we, in sugar-producing areas, we, who are in the sugar production business, would happily give up the sugar program if everybody else in the world gave up their sugar programs. That is the problem; and as I said in my opening statement, as President Reagan said, when you unilaterally disarm, you are asking for trouble.

We are bringing in 15 percent of our market in imports that we don't need to do. We could easily produce that in the United States.

So I would say to these other countries, you give up all of your support for your sugar industry, you bring in 15 percent in Brazil and Thailand and these other big sugar-producing areas, and we would be happy to compete because we will run them out of business.

The problem is, that is not the real world. So if you want to maintain these jobs and this industry in the country, the way to do it is with this current program. That is why it was put in in '08. That is why it was supported on both sides, in both the House and the Senate in 2013. And it works.

One of the speakers had said that we have these high consumer prices in the United States. That is not true. We have the cheapest, most affordable, most abundant, and safest food supply in the world in the United States, including sugar. And one of the reasons is because of the policies we have in place. One of those policies is the sugar policy.

So I would encourage my colleagues to oppose this resolution. As it was

stated, it is unnecessary. It is not something that is going to be considered by the conference committee anyway. I don't know why we are doing it, but it should be defeated in spite of that.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, in conclusion, again, this is reform. It is not a repeal of the sugar program. It is a very modest reform, simply going back to what the Secretary had before 2008 with the ability, the flexibility to allow sugar imports, when necessary, to meet domestic demand.

It allows sugar farmers to retain their price supports. It helps save American taxpayers and consumers money, about \$3.5 billion per year. It helps protect hundreds of thousands of good American manufacturing jobs. It does not require the import of a single additional pound of sugar, and it reduces market manipulation.

Madam Speaker, I urge the Members on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO CROP INSURANCE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I call up the resolution (H. Res 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 379

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642 (an Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes) should—

(1) agree to provisions relating to a limitation on premium subsidy based on average adjusted gross income in excess of \$750,000;

(2) agree to provisions relating to a requirement for the Secretary to carry out a study on crop insurance and the impacts of an adjusted gross income limitation, as specified in paragraph (1); and

(3) not agree to provisions relating to a delayed effective date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 379.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would like to thank Chairman LUCAS for his work on passing a farm bill through the House. It was not an easy task.

And the farm bill got a lot right, in my judgment. It eliminated direct payments. It made reforms to the food stamp program, which are in desperate need of reform. It consolidated duplicative programs, and the Agriculture Committee has started to implement very needed reforms of these programs. Unfortunately, I don't think it went far enough, which is why I am offering this sense of the House.

I think that we should accept what the Senate did—and they did it in a bipartisan fashion—to impose limits on premium subsidies going toward the wealthiest of farmers.

What this sense of the House does is it simply says, let's agree to the Coburn-Durbin amendment which said, for those making above \$750,000, the sense of the Congress is that their premiums for crop insurance should not be as generous as everybody else's. In fact, their premiums should be subsidized by 15 percentage points. This is hardly draconian. In fact, I would support going much farther than this, as I have voted consistently in the past.

But what this says is, if you are a farmer and you make more than \$750,000, all you will get is a crop insurance subsidy that is not as generous as everybody else's. It will be 15 percentage points less.

Let me give you an example. If you have protection for 50 percent of your yield, right now the Federal Government will subsidize 67 percent of that. Under this, if you make over \$750,000, you would be subsidized by 52 percent of your crop insurance. Hardly draconian.

So what we are simply saying is, we had a vote that was 59–33 in the Senate to limit the subsidy for crop insurance for very wealthy farmers. That is 1 percent of all of our agricultural producers in the country, and what we

should do is concede to that. We should agree with that in conference, and that is what the sense of this House resolution encourages.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

First, I would note, again, to my colleagues that this is one of the final stages of this long, challenging process of putting a comprehensive farm bill together.

With the conclusion of this debate on this sense of the Congress resolution and the votes that I suspect will come sometime later today or tomorrow, we will begin then with the appointment of conferees, the formal process of working out the differences between House and Senate bills. That is no small accomplishment, considering how many years Ranking Member PETERSON and I and the members of the House Agriculture Committee have put into this effort. As a matter of fact, when we started the process of gathering information and putting the hearing record together, I was the ranking member, and Mr. PETERSON was the chairman. So this has been a long, long process.

Now, I must say that I am obligated to rise in opposition to the resolution. I think the world of the author of this amendment, and in his role as chairman of the House Budget Committee, not only is he well-intentioned in this amendment and his many other efforts, but let's be honest, our friend has a tremendous amount of work on his plate, addressing everything from the issues about how we work our way out of this debt ceiling matter, how we address funding the Federal Government, how we finally put a budget resolution together. I know he is a busy, busy man; but I must say the committee focused very hard for literally years on all of these issues.

I won't pretend that with all of the things going on right now, not that many weeks after some very intense debate on the floor of this House, the goodly number of our Members are not focused on particular nuances of the farm bill, but on everything else going on.

But I would remind my good friends, the perspective of the House Ag Committee and the perspective of the majority—yes, maybe I have had too much fun with farm bills in recent years—of this process has led us to believe that it was important that we encourage participation in crop insurance. Crop insurance is like other insurance. It is about creating a pool of risk and spreading it out as far as you possibly can, having as many participants as you possibly can to share adversity, to contribute more premiums into that pool so that when you have that inevitable loss somewhere, you are better able to address it. And that is the perspective the committee took and I believe the House, as a whole, took. Get as many people involved in

utilizing and expanding the insurance pool as is possible.

Now, this sense of the Congress language is, in many ways, similar to the Senate language and would restrict the number of people based on AGI that would be able to participate, taking people out of the pool, shrinking the pool. These are, in all fairness, some of the most efficient farmers.

I will just simply ask my colleagues, remember the work of the committee and the work of this body. Help us keep this program as viable as possible.

□ 1745

Help us make sure that all farmers have the tools to mitigate their risk.

Now, there is one other perspective here, and we have talked about this many times, and it is the perspective of, what is the farm bill about? Is it about raising food and fiber? Is it about meeting the nutritional needs of our citizens in this country and having our surplus available to consumers around the rest of the world?

Or is it about deciding who a farmer should be, and using policy decisions within the farm bill to pick people who we want to farm, and to deny resources to people we don't happen to like who want to farm also?

I reject that also. Farm bills are about farming, raising food and fiber, meeting the needs.

I would ask again, very respectfully, of my colleagues, honor the decisions of the full House not all that long ago. Reject this sense of the House resolution.

Remember that you are helping us build on something that is kind of amazing in this session of Congress, a bill that came out of committee with \$40 billion in mandatory spending reform, with a bipartisan vote, a bill that left the United States House with a total of \$60 billion in mandatory spending reforms.

I can think of no other committee in this session of Congress that can lay claim to that—\$60 billion in mandatory reform.

Let us go to conference. Let us have as much flexibility as possible. Let us finish our work. Let us finish our good work, and we will bring a product back to you from conference that you can judge on its merits.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), the vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership on this issue and so many others and for allowing me to join him on this resolution.

Madam Speaker, under our current system, every farmer buying crop insurance gets a subsidy. The question is, How big should that subsidy be? Should all farmers receive a 62 percent crop insurance subsidy or more? Or should 1

percent of the most successful folks in agriculture receive a 47 or a 48 percent subsidy, which is exactly what this resolution would do?

While I support many of the reforms found in the House versions of our farm bill, unfortunately, no provision has been included which would limit crop insurance subsidies, and this resolution rectifies that glaring oversight.

This commonsense resolution will save the taxpayers nearly \$1 billion by instructing conferees to implement an economic test for those farmers with adjusted gross incomes over \$750,000. Those with incomes which exceed \$750,000 will see their crop insurance premium subsidy reduced by 15 percentage points.

We all understand and recognize the need for having a safety net in place for our Nation's farmers. This resolution does nothing, nothing, to undermine that safety net.

We all know the need for serious reforms also to our crop insurance programs. Last year, it cost more than \$14 billion, and without reforms, it is projected to be more than twice as expensive as the conventional commodity subsidy programs over the next decade.

So agreeing to this resolution would put into place the same provisions put forward as were mentioned in the Coburn-Durbin amendment in the Senate. That passed the Senate with significant bipartisan support earlier this past summer.

Currently, Madam Speaker, 4 percent of farmers receive 33 percent of the benefits of crop insurance. A stunning 73 percent of subsidy dollars goes to the top 20 percent of agribusinesses. That just doesn't make sense.

In a time of fiscal challenge, programs like crop insurance need serious modifications, and this is a step in the right direction. Though an incremental step, and a small one at that, it is, indeed, a step in the right direction.

Also, at a time when there is little bipartisan agreement in this town, this is just such an opportunity to enhance bipartisan cooperation.

Now, most folks on our side of the aisle, this side of the aisle, have been strongly supportive of an economic test for most taxpayer-subsidized programs. More actions like this are necessary in order to avoid this Nation's fiscal ruin.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of our primary subcommittee on the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the chairman for allowing us time to talk.

Madam Speaker, it is a bit surreal on a couple of levels, one, to be speaking from this side of the Chamber, and two, to be speaking against two of my colleagues who it is rare in my term here in Congress that I have been on a different side of an issue from—my good colleagues from Georgia and from Wis-

consin. But on this one I stand in strong opposition to the Ryan-Price amendment.

I just wanted to say how weird this feels to talk against something that my good colleagues from Wisconsin and Georgia are proposing to do.

One point that was just made was that there was a \$14 billion payout last year in disaster insurance losses to farmers in America. That's a cherry-picked year. Folks, remember, 2012 was historic droughts throughout most of ag production America, and so, consequently, last year was a much higher year than would have normally been the case. It is normally about \$4 billion a year in that regard.

I would also remind our colleagues that we fought this fight in July. Just like the Senate went one direction with the vote, we went the other direction, with a 208-217 vote on this floor. So we have had these conversations already and won this argument already.

This effort will punish success, will punish efficiency. It is hard to farm using \$300,000 tractors if you have got a small farm. It takes 3,000 acres to be able to support the implements and the tools needed to farm as efficiently as American farmers produce. And so we are punishing the folks who are the best at what they do.

Also, Madam Speaker, I would argue that this is a risk tool. This is not an income support tool. Income support tools, as some of our approps have gone, clearly means-testing those makes sense. We have had those in place for quite some time. But this is a risk management.

Risks at big farms are no different than risks on small farms, and to limit crop insurance, to restrict crop insurance this way is, in my view, wrong-headed.

I would also argue that using AGI at this stage in the development of the broader issues going on in this country creates several unknowns.

Both my colleagues from Wisconsin and Georgia are working very diligently on the Ways and Means Committee to, in effect, have a fundamental tax reform. That fundamental tax reform will have the impact of eliminating deductions and credits and, in effect, raising AGI. They can't tell us today where that AGI number is going to go to, so that creates one of the additional unknowns.

A second unknown is in their bill itself. Their resolution says they don't know what the impact is going to be. We heard the Budget Committee chairman say one percentage. We heard Mr. PRICE say a different percentage. So even on their side of their arguments, they are not clear yet on what the impact will be for folks who go above the \$750,000 AGI.

But their amendment itself, or their resolution says, in paragraph 2, agree with the provisions relating to the requirement for the Secretary to carry out a study on crop insurance and the impacts of an adjusted gross income limitation that this is going to impose.

All of my colleagues who will speak in favor of this are generally much more rational and logical about how they want to do things. Creating this new test would be like the fellow who dove into some unknown waters. As his feet left the bank he's saying, Wow, I wonder how deep it is going to be, and I wonder how cold it is going to be.

We don't know, they don't know exactly what impact this is going to have. So I would argue that, until we can fix a number on the AGI—and again, let me make sure that everybody understands. I am not saying anything whatsoever in opposition to the fundamental tax reform work that is going on. That has nothing to do with my comments.

They are going to change the number that they want to use. That, they cannot argue against. They cannot tell us yet where that is going to be. They are going to raise it, I know, because you can't lower and limit deductions and not raise folks' AGIs because business deductions will be involved in this. So they can't tell us where that is going to be for normal farmers.

So you can't look at a farmer today who might be making \$500,000 AGI—lowering the rates the way they are going to do may raise that farmer's AGI to something in excess of 750.

That person is in the exact economic circumstances they are now with respect to crop insurance and the risk management tool that that has provided, and yet they are going to be fundamentally impacted by this.

So I think this is ahead of its time. Wait on the study that the Senate bill calls for. I suspect my chairman will agree on that study that is going on.

But do not put this economic limit on crop insurance at this point in time. We have won this fight once with our colleagues. I would expect us to win it again. And I would urge my colleagues to vote against the Ryan-Price amendment that would have the impact they don't know yet on crop insurance.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the courtesy of my friend from Wisconsin, and I am pleased to join with him on the floor this evening debating this issue. It is something we have done over the years, working with Mr. KIND, with now Senator FLAKE, trying to inject a little more rationality and fiscal responsibility into this debate.

Madam Speaker, it is true that the House rejected a proposal during the debate on the farm bill, but 208 of our colleagues voted for a much more ambitious proposal. In fact, I believe that there were more votes for that crop insurance reform than were available for the first iteration of the farm bill itself.

This is a very modest step, and I appreciate it being brought forward, not because I think it is where we need to go ultimately, but I think that this is

the sort of thing we ought to be doing on the floor of the House because there are, in fact, areas of agreement to do a better job for the taxpayer, do a better job for more farmers and ranchers, protect the environment. The farm bill is replete with these opportunities.

I find the rhetoric about somehow picking winners and losers and shutting down the richest farmers ironic. The proposal that is offered by my friend, Mr. RYAN, does not deny the richest 1 percent of the farmers crop insurance. It just says, your subsidy is going to be about 50 percent. You have a 15 percent reduction.

That's not picking winners and losers. That's not denying them the use of this tool. But what we should be doing is actually doing a deeper dive.

Crop insurance right now is so lucrative that it, in many instances, actually pays farmers to plant ground that they know is going to fail. They can make money off of it because of how lavishly the crop insurance program is subsidized.

The premiums, the people who sell it, insure it against loss—I mean, study after study from independent, outside agencies suggests that there is a lot that we could do.

In fact, it is ironic that there has been this attack on food stamps, the SNAP benefit, which has a lower percentage of abuse than the crop insurance program. We are on board now, the next 10 years, to have crop insurance likely to be pushing up against \$100 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. But the fact is that this is an expensive entitlement in need of reform, with more areas of identified abuse than the food stamp program, which gets whacked, and we have a farm bill that is going to provide more lavish benefits for the wealthiest farmers.

I appreciate this discussion this evening. I hope it is the beginning of a more ambitious effort to do what needs to be done with crop insurance. But I think it is healthy to have it here.

I am pleased to join with my friend, Mr. RYAN, to agree with everything TOM PRICE said. Now that hasn't happened, I think, in any speech that he has given on the floor to this point. I am sure I am making him nervous agreeing with him.

But it illustrates the opportunity that we could have if we would take the time to work together on areas where there is bipartisan agreement and there is a clear need.

I appreciate the gentleman giving me the time. I appreciate him bringing it forward, and I urge support.

□ 1800

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 19 minutes

remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding the time and for his long-suffering and persistent leadership on this important issue.

I rise to ask my colleagues to please oppose efforts in this House to punish success and vote "no" on the Ryan resolution.

The viability of any insurance instrument requires broad participation. To maintain and foster improvement to our farm base and the stable food supply it provides, proper risk mitigation is essential. Although attacking the "wealthy" may appear to be noble, AGI limits for crop insurance will drive out large-risk pool participants, making the program less affordable for the farmers least able to do without it.

In North Dakota, the average farm is markedly different than the farm in Wisconsin. North Dakota family farms are thousands of acres involving multiple generations. The proposed AGI limits ignore this reality. They not only include income from farm operations, but other wholly unrelated earnings. USDA research shows average off-farm income greatly exceeds on-farm income, making the targets of this provision more collateral than intentional.

American farmers largely support the major policy shift that eliminates direct payments, relying solely on this cost-sharing arrangement with the Federal Government, resulting in 10 percent taxpayer savings. Unlike previous subsidies, farmers pay for this protection by contributing around 40 percent of the premium. The other 60 percent is not even expended by the government unless a claim is made.

The increasing role of Federal crop insurance as the foundation of the family farm safety net in recent years has diminished the need for crisis appropriations. Absent the stability of an actuarially sound program, future catastrophic disasters will result in greater ad hoc disaster payments. Let's not lose the momentum to shift from direct payments to crop insurance by compromising the financial soundness of this important program.

As the world population grows, the demand for food will increase. We should herald efficiency and increased productivity. Neither is achieved by punishing our most successful farmers.

Please oppose the Ryan sense of the House resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank Chairman RYAN for putting this resolution together. I also want to take time to recognize and thank Chairman LUCAS. In his tone and tenacity in putting together a farm bill, I think he has served as an example in this House of how to be a chairman and bring together divergent groups. I was very

supportive of what we have done, but I am also very supportive of this resolution here today.

Implementing a 15-percentage point reduction in crop insurance for producers with an adjusted gross income exceeding \$750,000, or \$1.5 million for joint filers, just like the Senate amendment, seems to be common sense, in my mind. However, this resolution calls for the elimination of delayed implementation in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment delays this. We are simply getting rid of the delay of this implementation. This means test proposal would save roughly \$1 billion over 10 years, something I think is very worthy for this body to consider.

On average, taxpayers are covering about 62 percent of crop insurance premiums. This proposal would reduce that to be about 47 percent, roughly, for high-income producers. It is still a very generous deal for very profitable producers. We encourage profitability. We want them to be as prosperous as they possibly can be. That does not mean that we have an unlimited amount of money that we can continue, as taxpayers, to cover some of those risks.

This reduction impacts roughly the top 1 percent of producers. There are other government assistance programs, such as Pell Grants and food stamps and earned income tax credits, that have some sort of means test to them. The least we can do is implement a modest means test for crop insurance subsidies for those making more than \$750,000 or, again, \$1.5 million for joint filers.

To be clear, nobody is kicked out of this program. Nobody is eliminated from this program. Contrary to the opponents' claim, this will not harm the insurance pool by driving out low-risk producers. Even with a 15-percent point reduction, the subsidy would still be huge and would be a good deal for high-income producers, since about half of the premium would still be subsidized. I encourage passage.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the good gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the chairman. I want to also commend him for his hard work on the farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know this has been a long and drawn-out process. Obviously, there are a lot of changes in agriculture, and also with the food stamp policy and with the economy. I know that this has been very difficult.

But I do want to rise in opposition to this sense of the House. As a farmer from Indiana who uses the crop insurance program, I understand a little bit about how this does affect farmers.

First of all, I would say that I think it is the right thing for us to do to eliminate the direct payment program. I think that is the right policy. That is in the bill, and I would continue to support it. I do think that we have some work to do on the crop insurance pro-

gram, but this is not the answer. If we are trying to limit or put a means test on those whom you would define as the wealthiest farmers in the country, I don't believe this is the correct way to do it.

Look at agriculture across the country. You have corn farmers in the Midwest, soybean farmers in the Midwest. You have specialty crops, whether it is green beans, strawberries, carrots, or potatoes. All of these have different variables in the amount of income that comes in per acre. So whether it is 10 acres or whether it is 10,000 acres, I believe that the risk is still great to American farmers and producers.

Let's also remember that the premium support is not a cash subsidy to farmers. Farmers don't all of a sudden open the mailbox and get a check in the mail, with premium support, which I think is an appropriate system for our insurance programs that the Federal Government can participate in; but I don't believe that using the AGI is the correct way to measure whether farmers should be participating at certain levels or not.

If we really wanted to means test, we would use taxable income, where farmers would be reporting certain incomes. AGI can vary from crop to crop, from farm to farm, and so taxable income would make much more sense if we are going to talk about any sort of means testing.

Also, I believe that it undermines the important landlord-tenant relationship. I have specifically been involved in this. Whether it comes to direct payments, obviously, with the increased cost of farmland over the past several years, those relationships are very, very important and very valuable.

Almost half of the farmland in this country is rented. I know that on our farm we rent almost three-quarters of the land that we farm. If land owners can no longer afford crop insurance, they can simply transfer that risk to tenants through cash leases. You end up hurting the smaller farmers that rely on rented farmland.

So I don't believe that this particular idea is ready for us to move forward on. I think that it needs more work. I think that the intentions by the author are sincere in trying to lessen the burden on the American taxpayer; but, at the same time, let's not hurt the American farmer and create, basically, a system that can treat a farmer in the South differently than a farmer in the Midwest or a farmer in the North.

Let's go back and reevaluate the system. I think that if you talk to the farming industry, you talk to farmers, they will come to the table and will try to find a reasonable way.

At this time, I would oppose this sense of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Ryan sense of the House resolu-

tion which would improve the 2013 farm bill by reducing insurance subsidies for the wealthiest producers, saving taxpayers almost \$1 billion.

The Senate bill includes a provision authorized by Senator Richard Durbin and TOM COBURN to reduce the level of crop insurance premium subsidies for participants with an adjusted gross income over \$750,000 by 15 percent. The amendment was approved in the Senate on a bipartisan basis, 59-33. During the House consideration of the farm bill, I offered a companion amendment which was, unfortunately, not made in order.

By supporting this sense of the House, our Chamber now has an opportunity to go on record to support this modest, very commonsense reform. The limitation is expected to impact only 1 percent of the wealthiest farmers in the entire country. The vast majority of farmers in our district will see no change in the level of premium provided by the Federal Government.

Last year, the Federal Government spent \$7 billion to cover 62 percent of crop insurance premiums. A 2012 GAO study found that 4 percent of the most profitable farmers accounted for nearly one-third of all Federal premium support. Now is the time to include modest means testing to reforms in crop insurance programs.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Ryan sense of the House to protect taxpayers in the new farm bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you, Chairman RYAN, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be on the floor on this bipartisan issue, which we certainly don't have enough of today, and I am happy to be here as well with the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, whom I have had the privilege to work with, even though we possibly don't agree on this issue.

I, too, was pleased to offer a similar amendment during the farm bill process and was glad to see Mr. HANNA speak on that earlier. That amendment was actually called the Hanna-Pingree amendment. I digress for a minute because I was particularly sentimental about that amendment since my daughter is named Hannah Pingree. Unfortunately, that amendment met its demise. I am just pleased to see we are back here discussing this topic.

The sense of Congress is a very small step toward a basic, commonsense reform: modestly reducing premium payments for the most successful farm businesses in America. Don't let anyone tell you otherwise—99 percent of crop insurance holders will see absolutely no change in their premium payments; but for a very few, the absolute richest, they will see a very small increase in their premiums. We are just

asking those few to pay something a little closer to their fair share.

To put this in perspective, crop insurance is the only farm income support program that is not subject to some form of payment limitation or means testing. Honestly, I would like to see a much stronger crop insurance reform; but for now, for this farm bill, for today, this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this commonsense reform.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This debate is coming to a conclusion. I appreciate that greatly. The civil tone, the nature of the discussion, is something that we should do more of in this body; but I would note a couple of quick thoughts to my colleagues.

There have been many references made to the historic crop insurance payments made in the 2012 crop year. One of those amazing circumstances was huge amounts of the Midwest, some of the most productive corn land in America, simply didn't produce a crop—or not much of a crop. That is no fault of the farmer involved. That is Mother Nature's decision not to provide the right amount of moisture or, in other places, too much moisture.

□ 1815

But, you see, that is what crop insurance is all about. When I first came here, we had a system that worked around—not crop insurance, which didn't work very well and wasn't subscribed to by a lot of people. We had a system of ad hoc disasters. If you had a problem here or a problem there, then you would have a special appropriations bill to fund that disaster. Those special bills tended to grow and expand; and over time, they became a huge drain on the Treasury.

That is why, starting aggressively in the '96 farm bill—pushed even harder by then-Chairman PETERSON in the 2008 farm bill—the focus became: no more ad hoc disasters bills. Have a crop insurance program that works. Make it clear to producers that, if you have a problem, you have to have insurance, that you have to participate, that you have to pay the premiums.

Now, over the course of approximately the last decade, setting the 2012 year aside, this has become an amazingly orderly system. Many Members in this room don't remember ad hoc agricultural disaster bills because this has worked that well. I would challenge you in most—in more than in the majority of the years—that the resources coming into the program have been greater than the payments going out, but that is the way insurance is supposed to work—you pay in in good years, and you hope you never use the product; but in bad years, the assistance is there. Call it crop insurance. Call it life insurance. Call it fire insurance on your house. It is the principle behind the concept.

Now, the specific language we address here.

There has been much discussion about the draft that the United States Senate has adopted in its farm bill. It is the same 750 number, and he does include a study; but one of the main differences between what we are addressing today and what the Senate has in its language in going to conference is that the study, in effect, requires the USDA look at the effect of this limitation on the participation in the program and determine if that affects the viability of the program. Does it change the dynamics? Does it suddenly become a greater expense as you shrink the pool? It gives the Secretary the authority, if that study determines that this will be negative to crop insurance, to suspend the provision. That is not in this sense of Congress. It says, "You shall." "You will."

One other passing thought: there has been a lot of discussion about reducing the numbers, the percentages, from 65 to 50. I will just simply note to you that in many cases that, in effect, is not just a 15 percent move; that is a 40 percent move. Think about that. If you are a farmer—who is a businessperson—assessing the cost of your inputs and trying to match that up with a potential return on your outputs, you are going to make those hard business decisions.

Again, I think the world of my colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee. I know he has a lot of things on his plate, and I know he has had a great many challenges in his tenure as chairman of the House Budget Committee; but I will tell you that I think the Ag Committee has worked very diligently to craft language that we are now about to send to conference in order to work out the ultimate bill that reflects a lot of open process—in committee, on the floor, in a lot of input with motions to instruct today, and in another sense of the House resolution. We have acknowledged and responded to that input.

You have battled as Members of this body—and debated and discussed and voted—on all of these issues before. I would just ask my colleagues to remember what this body decided not all that long ago and that, also, as we go to conference with the Senate, it is going to be a very difficult thing to protect our \$60 billion in mandatory spending reform that you have directed us to do. Give the committee, give me, give the ranking member as many tools and as much flexibility as you can so that we may prevail from the House's point of view in accomplishing common policy with the Senate that meets not only the goals of this Chamber, but the needs of this country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask for a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Com-

mittee for a very civil debate. He and I have talked about so many of these issues. We have worked so well together, and he has done the yeoman's work on moving these bills to the floor. On this particular issue, we don't agree. He may not think that I am helping, but I think I am helping by passing this. The reason is that this passed 59-33 in the Senate. If we pass it here, that just takes off the table one contentious issue that they don't have to negotiate in conference, making it easier to focus on the other things that you have yet to reconcile in conference. So we are actually trying to help the Ag Committee out here. That is one way you can put it.

On a more serious note, I want to talk about a few of the criticisms.

Pooling. My friend from North Dakota mentioned that it is important to have crop insurance with these people with very, very high adjusted gross incomes in the pool to make the cash flow. That is an actuarial argument that works with health insurance—healthy people subsidize sick people—but that is really not an argument that, I think, flows with this kind of insurance.

Point number two: no one is saying that a person who has a high net worth, who has a high adjusted gross income can't get crop insurance. All we are saying is just don't subsidize him as much as everybody else. That is really not asking a lot. What we are saying is, if you are a farmer and if you make \$750,000 of adjusted gross income or higher, you don't get subsidized by the taxpayer for your crop insurance as much as everybody else. Your subsidy is 15 percentage points lower than that of the people who make less than \$750,000. You still get crop insurance. You can still buy it. You will still get a subsidy, just not as much as everybody else.

Look, if you buy insurance on 50 percent of your acres, instead of the government paying for 67 percent of that insurance, it will pay for 52 percent of your insurance. If you buy insurance to cover 65 percent of your acres, instead of the government paying 59 percent of the cost, it would pay 44 percent of the cost. If you buy insurance on 85 percent of your acres, instead of the government subsidizing 38 percent of the cost of that coverage, it will subsidize 23 percent of the cost of that coverage. So there is still a subsidy.

You are not penalizing or punishing success by not subsidizing people as much. If we were having a tax debate—if we were talking about raising taxes—then you are penalizing success. If we are talking about taxing and taking money from producers—from successful people, from businesses making any amount of money—then you are penalizing success. What we are saying is just don't subsidize people as much because this subsidy is taking money from hardworking taxpayers—from their taxes—to give to somebody else. What we are saying is let's not take

money from hardworking taxpayers to give as much to farmers who are making more than \$750,000. We just don't want to subsidize them as much. That is not punishing success.

The other point is that this is one of those rare moments in which I think there is bipartisan agreement that a farm bill really ought to be for family farmers. The purpose of the farm program is to make sure that individual families can stay farming, and that means the safety net needs to be there for that family farm. I know in Wisconsin most of our farmers don't make \$750,000, so it probably doesn't affect many of the corn and bean or dairy farmers whom I represent. Maybe in North Dakota and in other States there are people with thousands of acres who make that kind of money. I think that is great—I think that is wonderful—but I still think that our taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize them as much as the family farmer.

This is one of those opportunities in which I think Congress can speak with a bipartisan voice. I really believe, if the Hanna-Pingree amendment or the Blumenauer-Mulvaney amendment had been made in order, it probably would have passed. So this is our chance here in the House to speak with one voice on a bipartisan basis. Let's not subsidize folks at the high end as much, and let's protect that family farmer. Let's agree with the Senate and take this issue off the table as one of those contentious issues because we are agreeing bipartisanly and bicamerally that we ought to have a farm program for the family farmer and somewhere limit these subsidies. That is all we are asking for.

With that, I ask for its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORE DEMOCRAT VOICES MUST BE HEARD

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, more Democrat leaders are finding their voices and courage to speak out against the continued shutdown of government services by Senate Majority Leader REID. This was evident on Wednesday as District of Columbia Mayor Vincent Gray crashed a Senate Democratic press conference near the Capitol.

Mayor Gray took the opportunity to ask a simple and logical question of the Senate: Would the Senate vote on the House-passed measure to permit the

District of Columbia to utilize tax revenues it collects to fund municipal services during this shutdown?

This measure, H.J. Res. 71, passed the House more than a week ago with support from Washington Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and other Democrats in the House. This targeted appropriations bill, like the many others the House has passed with bipartisan support, still languishes in the Senate.

When the Mayor approached Senator REID to discuss the funding for the District of Columbia, the Senate Majority Leader replied: I am on your side, okay? Don't screw it up.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whose side the Senate Majority Leader is on, but it has not been on the side of the American people.

A WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

OBAMACARE

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words about accountability.

Normally, the way it works is that Congress can consider a piece of legislation. Maybe it passes. Maybe the President signs it. You implement it. Then the voters can decide whether they like it, whether it lived up to its billing, so to speak.

With ObamaCare, it was interesting because this was rammed through Congress at the beginning of 2010; yet it is just now really being implemented. I am starting to get a lot of people in my district contacting my office who are really shocked at some of the stiff premium increases they are seeing. So I think it is useful just to review some of the promises that were made and whether any of those promises have been kept. I think what you will find is that this is a law not only that the public opposed, not only that was rammed through with no bipartisan support, but a law that in many ways is resting on false pretenses.

Promise one, the President made this: it will lower premiums by up to \$2,500 for a typical family per year.

I have not seen that true anywhere. In fact, people are seeing \$2,500 increases. There was a family in California, it was reported, who saw an increase of \$10,000. So I think, right here, as this is being implemented, we know that that is just not going to be the case.

□ 1830

Promise number two, the President said this: "If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan." Period.

Well, we know that that is not true. We see spouses losing spousal coverage. We see people with major companies losing their employer-provided insurance, getting pushed into some of these exchanges.

So the idea that "if you like your plan, you can keep it" is absolutely not proving to be true for thousands of people throughout the country.

This is just beginning. People who have looked at this from the Congressional Budget Office to other groups say you could have anywhere from 7 to 30 million Americans who actually lose their employer plans because of ObamaCare.

Of course, if you are losing your plan and you are getting pushed into an exchange, you may not be able to keep your doctor because that doctor may not be in the network, may not be available based on the plan that you are having to take because you have lost your original plan.

Promise number three—this is the President: "I can make a firm pledge: under my plan no family making less than \$250,000 will see any form of tax increase."

Well, we know that the individual mandate he said wasn't a tax. Then when it got challenged in the Supreme Court, his administration was saying, yeah, uphold it because it is a tax. That is eventually what the court did, saying that it is a tax. That is a tax that hits blue collar "salt of the Earth" people, forcing them to buy a product that essentially they may not even be physically able to obtain because the Web sites don't work, and if not, they are going to tax you. That certainly hasn't been true.

But there are a whole bunch of other things in the law that hit middle-income and lower-income people. There is a cap on flexible spending accounts. It is actually harder under ObamaCare to deduct medical expenses from your income taxes. Even a tax on indoor tanning salons. I think there are a lot of people who make less than \$250,000 a year who are doing the tanning salons.

Then, of course, there are a whole bunch of other taxes—over a trillion dollars—that may not be directly levied on somebody making less than \$250,000, but the costs will end up being passed on. For example, the employer mandate, the tax on health insurance plans, the medical device tax. Those taxes are on companies, but those costs are going to get pushed to individuals, and they are going to have to bear the cost of that. And, oh, by the way, certain good health care plans that a lot of union members have who are not making \$250,000 a year, those are considered Cadillac plans, and those will be taxed extra going forward.

Finally, the President said: "I will sign a universal health care bill into law by the end of my first term as President that will cover every American." It is interesting—people on the other side of the aisle will say, oh, you

Republicans, why don't you want everybody to be covered? The most recent analysis from the Congressional Budget Office said that in 10 years from now—so after 13 years of ObamaCare being the law—you will still have in this country 31 million Americans that don't have any insurance. Of course, we know ObamaCare is causing people to lose the insurance that they have.

So this is not something that is a universal health care bill, by any stretch of the imagination. There are going to be a lot of people who aren't going to have any insurance.

The point I just wanted to make with this is, there has got to be accountability in government. People want to have a redress of their grievances. These issues were not necessarily teed up in the election, and so now people are coming to terms with what has happened. So the point I would just make is, at a minimum when you are dealing with the broken promises of ObamaCare, we have got to communicate to the public that this has got to be based on some semblance of fairness.

For example, the Members of Congress who wrote this law must live under the exact terms of the statute. They should not be granted any extra legal relief from the burdens of ObamaCare. The fact that businesses have had the law delayed for them—and, of course, Members of Congress have gotten special treatment as well—I think individual Americans have got to be given the same deal. It is just wrong to have the IRS tax people to buy something from Web sites that aren't functional—and buy products that they may not like.

So accountability is key. This is a law that was passed. There were specific promises made over and over again. What we are finding now, unfortunately, is those promises are not being kept.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much my friend from Florida. I am always greatly appreciative and thrilled when I find somebody who attended an Ivy League school that got a good education.

The points are well made by my friend from Florida. There were many promises made and promises not kept. Go from top to bottom:

"If you like your insurance, you can keep it." Not remotely true.

"If you like your doctor, you can keep them." Not remotely true. So many stories are coming forward.

"It is actually going to be cheaper for Americans under ObamaCare." Not remotely true, unless perhaps you are in New York. There is a small part of the country, a small group of individuals, who were already paying so much because of a massive amount of waste or laws that allowed for a great amount of waste or abuse; in those there may be some people that actually saved money. But for most Americans, they are not only going to have to pay more, they are going to pay dramatically more.

As we have seen the government shutdown play out, it has been interesting to note the things that have been open and the things that have been closed. We were told that only essential government services would be provided.

We had also passed immediately before the shutdown and sent to the Senate a military pay bill. Now, that military pay bill was intentionally left broad enough so that it could take care of the need to take care of the death benefit, broad enough to take care of the needs of the family that are always provided by the military, by the Department of Defense, for those who paid the ultimate sacrifice in losing a loved one in the course of combat. And lo and behold, even though that was made clear, it also was made clear in the bill that civilian employees could be included. Even independent contractors under that law were allowed to continue working that were supporting the role of the military. So it was a very broadly worded act in order to give the Obama administration, and particularly the Defense Department, great latitude to make sure important things got done.

Now as we have seen, the Secretary of Defense has laid off hundreds of thousands of civilian workers, though the bill gave him latitude to leave them working and they supported the military. It was only after about a week that they finally said, okay, we are going to let a whole lot of those employees come back now that we have made the determination that the bill gives us enough latitude to allow them to work.

We told him it did. The bill gave him that kind of power. Perhaps he had talked to President Obama and they decided, yeah, let's put lots of people out of work, or perhaps he had not talked to the President. We don't know.

But as Peggy Noonan pointed out recently, talking about things that have gone on here in the last couple of weeks, she reminded us of Harry Truman's sign that was on his desk: "The buck stops here."

They didn't have to hurt all those civilian employees. They could have left them working. But they chose to send them home, creating more hardship. They chose not to pay the death benefit for families who were entitled to it after losing a loved one who is a patriot. They chose to do those things.

They have chosen to close parks, farms, different things that don't cost the Federal Government a dime, don't cost anything. But they have strategically chosen to close things that create suffering, some chaos, different problems for people. It is as if the park rangers, who were quoted recently, were exactly right in saying that they were told: make life as difficult as possible for people, because that is what the administration has done.

But there is good news. This story was published by FOX News:

National Parks Are Closed, the IRS Call Centers Have No Staff.

And I insert parenthetically here:

The IRS is still getting your money in, the money is still flowing in, they are just not helping people as it flows in.

The article says:

Countless government Web sites have been taken down.

We know even the panda camera was turned off, even though it required no monitoring.

Yet despite these changes, which range from inconveniences to major headaches, a number of not so essential government operations are still up and running. Here are a few that have evaded the partial government shutdown:

The Denali commission.

You have probably never even heard of the Denali Commission. But the tiny Alaska-based economic development agency gained some notoriety after it emerged that the group's inspector general was petitioning Congress to defund it.

But guess what agency survived the shutdown? According to its own contingency plan, because the Commission's staffers are paid under the prior year's budget, all 14 employees are exempt from furlough, and "reporting to work."

That is a commission that its own inspector general petitioned Congress to defund.

Another government function that was left up: "The White House Twitter." Oh, sure, there were plenty of government help Web sites that would have made life easier for people having to deal with the Federal Government. They were shut down because they would have helped people. But the White House Twitter was left up and rolling. As the article says:

Right as Congress missed the deadline last week to pass a spending bill, First Lady Michelle Obama's office informed its Twitter followers that: "Due to Congress' failure to pass legislation to fund the government," updates to the official First Lady Twitter account would be limited.

But the White House Twitter account is alive and well.

The account has blasted out a series of tweets calling on Congress to end the budget impasse.

Another item that has been left up and running despite all of the government Web sites and help call centers and all that have been shut down, and that is "Let's Move." The article says:

While a number of government Web sites have been temporarily taken offline, and the First Lady's Twitter account has been largely abandoned, not so for Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign.

The Web site for the First Lady's healthy-living initiative remains operational—though it doesn't appear to have been updated much since September. The top of the site displays the message: "Cheers to Water!"

Another thing left up was the "Park Rangers on Patrol."

Despite national parks and monuments being shuttered across the country for lack of funds, the National Park Service is devoting considerable resources to putting up barricades and patrolling them.

An innkeeper along the Blue Ridge Parkway who was forced to close his business due

to the partial shutdown told FOXNews.com that park rangers have set up a "24/7 blockade" outside his inn—to prevent would-be customers from coming in.

Another thing, the "Obama Campaign Stop."

President Obama canceled a long-planned trip to Asia over the budget impasse.

But he, nevertheless, ventured outside the beltway last week for a rally in nearby Rockville, Maryland, to pressure Republicans to pass a budget bill.

□ 1845

The article says budget bill, but actually we are past the budget time. Now it is appropriation time, and that is what we need.

The Patent Office. If you happened to invent something during the stalemate, good news. The United States Patent and Trademark Office is open for business. According to the office, it is using fees from the prior year to keep running and should be able to for roughly 4 weeks.

The IRS is taking but not giving. IRS call centers are closed. The IRS is not issuing refunds during the partial shutdown. The agency, though, will gladly accept tax payments during that time. The IRS says in a statement on its Web site:

The IRS will accept and process all tax returns with payments, but will be unable to issue refunds during this time.

Another article from the Right Scoop had talked about the Amber Alert Web site being taken down. Although some have been kept up, the Amber Alert Web site was allowed to go down. And, thankfully, the administration realized there was enough pressure. For heaven's sake, it is for children who are kidnapped, lost. So, thankfully, the administration finally decided after enough pressure to bring the Amber Alert Web site back up.

It has been amazing to me, and I saw it again today in some of our memorial sites, memorials that are down on The Mall, the Iwo Jima monument, or the memorial, we have spent—this administration, that is, has spent more money keeping people out of open-air memorials than it ever spends just to leave them open. They are open 24/7. I have been up to the Iwo Jima, the U.S. Marine Corps monument so many times since I have been in Congress, again, all hours of the day and night. I don't sleep that much while I am here on the Hill.

Although we have some park rangers who don't know the parking laws and give tickets to people who are lawfully allowed to be there—apparently not enough training for our rangers—but they have gone to the trouble to get barriers to make life difficult for veterans, World War II veterans that fought to secure Iwo Jima, being kept out of seeing the Iwo Jima monument. Why? Because they put barricades in the way to keep people from going up and being able to drive up there.

One of the times I went up there during the last couple of weeks, there were probably 200 people up there, but they

had to park over by the townhouses, go over rails, down steep embankments and get in there. Unfortunately, as this administration knows, our World War II veterans in their eighties and nineties that I have been with and that I have helped and pushed wheelchairs for, they are not able to climb over rails and go down steep embankments, although they sure did while fighting in the Pacific, European theater, and North Africa. But they cannot do it now. And for anyone to keep putting up the barricades at that Iwo Jima monument just to screw over our veterans is outrageous. I don't know who is doing it, but shame on the people who are doing it.

I was gratified last weekend, on one occasion I went up there, and there were plastic barricades that had been filled with water to hold them in place, make them too big for a person to push over, and yet there were three busloads of World War II veterans up at the Iwo Jima monument, and someone had rammed those plastic barriers, knocking them over, spilling the water everywhere. Once the water was dispersed, pushed them out of the way. A wooden barricade looked like it had been run over so the buses could go up there. I don't know if those buses did that or not. I like to think they did, that those World War II veterans were not going to have some mean-spirited person in the administration up there to prevent them from seeing the Iwo Jima monument for one time before they left this world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people in this administration that keep trying to punish the American people so that they can get the money that they are demanding, that S&P and Moody's has said you guys have to get responsible about the money you are spending, the money that American taxpayers gave the Republicans, the majority, in 2010 to do something about. My friends across the aisle are constantly saying elections have consequences. That is right. The American people didn't like ObamaCare, and so they voted the Democrats in the House out of the majority with people running on that main issue. We will do everything we can to get rid of ObamaCare.

It is true that the President won reelection. Many of us still believe that if we had had a candidate that could challenge the abuses of ObamaCare before the last election last year instead of one that gave a prototype for it in his home State, the President would not have been reelected. But Republicans chose a very nice man, a philanthropic man, a great businessman, a very caring American, but somebody who had already shown he supported a type of socialized medicine in his home State.

ObamaCare, as it was passed, as it was originating in the Senate and then passed in the Senate, sent down to the House as bill H.R. 3590, should have originated in this House because it raises revenue, called penalties. It is

called penalties throughout the bill. The Supreme Court noted that. In a very hypocritical opinion, the Supreme Court went to page 15 and noted that Congress called it a penalty. It only is applied if people don't do what is required. That makes it a penalty. Clearly, it is a penalty because the anti-injunction act makes very clear that if Congress passes a tax, then no Federal court can take it up and make a decision on it until the tax is actually imposed and the person suing has standing by virtue of having the tax actually imposed on them. That is a nutshell.

So if the Supreme Court had found that ObamaCare contained a tax and not a penalty, then it would not have jurisdiction. But the Supreme Court opinion at page 15 decided it is a penalty; it is not a tax. If it was a tax, we couldn't go any further on the opinion. The opinion would be over. We would have to dismiss and wait for the tax to actually be assessed. But since it is a penalty, like Congress called it through the bill, and since it is a penalty, as President Obama made very clear to the American public—it is not a tax; it is a penalty—the Supreme Court went on. Eventually, after determining that ObamaCare, as written, based on what the proponents said was the interstate commerce clause that gave it the authority to pass ObamaCare, the Supreme Court said, no, it doesn't. The interstate commerce clause does not give authority to Congress to pass a bill that takes over health care. That is not constitutional.

Then eventually they got over and took up the issue of exactly what was involved in the individual mandate, the business mandate, and the Court concluded that actually, despite Congress calling it a penalty, the President assuring America it was a penalty and not a tax, the Supreme Court ends up saying it is a tax, and, therefore, it is constitutional. So we, as the Supreme Court, will rewrite the law and uphold it as we have rewritten; because as it is written, it is not constitutional, but we will rewrite it. Though that would be legislating and it would be unconstitutional, they did it anyway.

So when I hear people say it has been upheld by the Supreme Court, no, the bill that was passed was not upheld by the Supreme Court. It was struck down as violating the interstate commerce clause, but the Supreme Court did them a favor. They rewrote it legislatively, violated the Constitution in doing so, and then sent it back.

And now Americans across the country, by the millions, are suffering as a result of a tax the majority of Americans did not want, that all Americans promised was not a tax, and now it is taking away their insurance. It is taking away their doctors. It is taking away, really, quality health care that most Americans had.

So it would seem if the idea behind ObamaCare was strictly to help those who are uninsured, we should have dealt strictly with those Americans.

But that is not what ObamaCare was about. It was about the G-R-E, the government running everything.

I am amazed at how many friends across the aisle who have screamed and hollered about we don't want the government in our bedroom voted for a bill that puts the government in your bedroom, in your bathroom, in your kitchen, in your closets. It puts the Federal Government everywhere. And you combine that with what the all Democratic majority House and Senate passed with President Obama at the helm, that created a bureau under the guise of making sure that credit card companies were fair, and now that bureau is gathering everyone's credit card information and debit card information under the guise of making sure they are playing fair. This Federal Government has seized more private information. They have been more vindictive through weaponizing the IRS, and we are finding out about other agencies and departments. It is more than any administration has ever done, and American people will ultimately pay the price.

I hope and pray that the Supreme Court will take up the origination clause litigation because that bill did not originate in the House; and the origination clause says any bill that raises revenue must originate in the House, and the only single thing in that bill that was left was the number. Even the title about being a change to the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit for first time home buyers who were in the military or veterans, they didn't leave a single word of that bill; and they brought in something completely ungermane to that bill for veterans and military members.

□ 1900

And instead of taking care of the millions they said were uninsured, that was the whole purpose of ObamaCare, they have done tremendous damage across the country to so very many.

As the shutdown has gone on that was brought on, not by the House Republicans, who passed a bill, we said, Look, Americans are being devastated by ObamaCare. The health care industry is being decimated.

Since a majority of the American people didn't want it, gave us control of the House as a result of it, let's get rid of it. We have got to start acting responsibly about the money we spend. Taking away Americans' rights to decide whether they should have knee surgery, back surgery, get a pacemaker, taking away the right and the ability of Americans to determine what kind of treatment they should get is not something, when we are in financial difficulty, we should be doing. That was struck down. It shouldn't have been a surprise. HARRY REID didn't want to pass it. The President didn't want to.

Then the House began sending down one compromise which was turned down. Okay, let's just suspend it for a year. That would be the fair thing to

do. As so many have said, Republicans and Democrats across the country, it was not ready for prime time. It was a train wreck. It was a nightmare. Let's just suspend it for a year. We know the President wants it, so we are not talking about getting rid of it like a majority of Americans want to do. Let's just suspend it for a year.

When that didn't go and the Senate said, No, we want a shutdown, we are not doing this, then we sent down a further compromise to basically suspended for 1 year the individual mandate just as businesses had gotten, as the President rewrote the law. The Constitution doesn't allow him to do it. Congress is supposed to step up, as happened in past generations where I'm told no matter whether a Democrat or Republican President, no matter who controlled the House and Senate, when a President overstepped his constitutional authority this far, usually there would be a trip down Pennsylvania from leaders of the House and Senate, both parties, that would privately tell the President, You overstepped your bounds. Back off, or we are going to defund everything that you are trying to push through on this, and it would get worked out.

Unfortunately, at the other end of the Hall in the Senate, they are not bothered by the fact that the President, by a stroke of the pen, wrote legislation and undid what the law said and made up his own law. That is not supposed to happen under our Constitution, but it did. We were bothered by it in the House, so we said, Look, let's work this out like gentle people. Let's just postpone it for a year. When that didn't work, we said, Let's at least suspend the individual mandate. You have suspended it for the business community. Let's do it for individuals. They wouldn't even do that.

Then when that didn't work, we sent a bill to the Senate that said, Okay, we are not trying to push anything on you. Just sit down and talk. Here are our negotiators. You appoint your negotiators. That is what the Constitution, law, and the rules require, and we will have this worked out probably by the time people get up in the morning; and they would not even appoint negotiators. Why? Because I believe they believe the conventional wisdom from the last 3 years that if the Democratic Senate and President forced a shutdown, the Main Street media would blame Republicans. It would enure politically to their benefit, and it would be worth causing the pain of a shutdown. So they refused to even negotiate at that point. It was not until the polls showed that the President had dropped to 37 percent from a favorable rating of 53 percent to an unfavorable rating that we finally had a willingness to sit down and talk.

During those times that so many things have been shut down, including the Normandy Cemetery—this story emerged yesterday from Market-place.org:

Coming Soon to Your Favorite TV Shows: Plot Lines About the Affordable Care Act.

Hollywood Health & Society, a program with the USC Annenberg Norman Lear Center got a \$500,000 grant this week from The California Endowment to help TV writers tell better stories about the new health insurance law.

That is \$500,000 to Hollywood for propaganda to tell people who are suffering from the ravages of losing their insurance, losing their doctors, losing the ability to make decisions under new policies as they once did, telling them how good they had it. That \$500,000 would have paid to open a lot of memorials and parks. It would have kept the Moore farm going for years that doesn't get a dime of Federal money and hasn't since 1980, but may lose the farm because of the outrageous actions of the National Park Service in forcing it closed; as the park Ranger said, making it as difficult as they can for people.

Here is an article from Ken Blackwell:

When President Obama signed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on March 23, 2010, it was the starting gun for a massive Federal effort to get the new system up and running. The administration had deliberately allowed for 3½ years for the launch, October 1, 2013.

That's a long time. It's 1,288 days. You would think, in that length of time, we could have brought a system online that would not be bedeviled with glitches. And more glitches.

By comparison, FDR had 912 days from the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, to D-day, June 6, 1944, the Allied invasion of Normandy. The D-day Museum at Portsmouth, England maintains a Web site that offers some idea of what was involved in mounting the invasion.

It says further down:

Today, Obama administration officials are making the rounds of TV talk shows touting the millions of Americans who have logged on day one of ObamaCare. They are not able tell us how many of those millions have actually signed up for ObamaCare. But that, of course, may be due to the fact that 85% of Americans already have health insurance and the rest, primarily healthy young adults, may have reasons for not having health insurance.

It's interesting to hear administration spokespersons dodging and weaving about how many Americans actually are eager to give all their personal data to the IRS and then be guided about by navigators chosen by Mr. Obama out of his compassionate concern for his people. Obama Cares was an inspired idea for a bumper sticker last fall. It helped the incumbent easily gain a second term in the White House.

It's odd, though, that after 4 years of major liberal legislation, the FDR comparisons have largely disappeared.

Americans today can judge how warm-hearted President Obama is. His administration has ordered the closure of the World War II Memorial in Washington. Ninety-year olds on Honor Flights faced barricades as they made that last trip to see the monument to their heroism on D-day and a thousand days.

White House spokesman Jay Carney raced to tell reporters that it was not the intent of the Obama administration to deny death benefits to families of soldiers recently killed in Afghanistan. It just seems to have

been another glitch. The Obama spokesman's efforts to avoid responsibility were strenuous. But he might have consulted another veteran of that great WWII generation. Harry Truman kept a plaque on his desk in the White House: The Buck Stops Here.

That was the article I was thinking of earlier.

Here's another article from October 10 by Jocelyn Maminta from New Haven, Connecticut.

In the midst of major changes in health care, UnitedHealthCare has sent thousands of pink slips to Connecticut doctors.

Termination letters went to physicians caring for Medicare patients. Those letters were sent out to doctors caring for "Medicare Advantage" patients. It's a plan, marketed to seniors to provide additional services through UnitedHealthCare.

A mix of primary care and specialty doctors are affected by it. And it comes at a questionable time.

Open enrollment for Medicare starts next Tuesday, and it's still not clear at this time as to which doctors are still in the United network.

The Connecticut State Medical Society is fighting back. The biggest concern is patient access to healthcare.

"What the government is looking for is to manage better care by adding a patient-centered medical home so that you have a doctor who is totally invested with taking care of every aspect of the patient and coordinating it. This is clearly not a patient-centered decision," said Dr. Michael Saffir, president of CT State Medical Society.

Perhaps that is Connecticut Medical Society.

Anyway, it has an update at the bottom:

In an email statement, UnitedHealthCare spokesman Ben Goldstein told News 8, "With the many changes happening in health care, we are building a network of health care providers that we can collaborate with more closely to have the most positive impact on the quality of care for our members.

And what a lot of people didn't realize, but they soon found out, ObamaCare, the so-called "Affordable Care Act," actually cut over \$700 billion in Medicare reimbursements. It took money that was going to be used for senior citizens' health care and put it towards trying to get this horrendous, this unworkable bill to the American people.

May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. In an article from WND Radio published October 10, they wrote:

Sticker Shock! Americans Floored By ObamaCare Cost.

The technical problems with the ObamaCare insurance exchanges are no surprise, are further evidence the whole program should be delayed or scrapped and Americans will be even more horrified when they can get somewhere on the Web site, according to health care policy expert Grace-Marie Turner.

The first 10 days of the ObamaCare insurance exchanges have been a technological and public relations mess for the administration. Many Americans have suffered through hours of stalled or crashed Web sites, no reporter has yet been able to navigate the site, and many people have entered personal in-

formation that online security experts believe could make them targets for identity theft.

□ 1915

When WND spent hours online and on the phone trying to get a cost estimate for an ObamaCare plan, it was told to expect a quote by January 1. As WND reported, anecdotal evidence on the government's own health care Facebook page suggests both problems are significant factors.

A few users seemed simply confused, but the overwhelming number of comments were critical, and many of those were scathing. Complaints about the application process had three recurring themes: long waits, glitches, and sticker shock. There was also much ridicule of the site's ability to handle "tremendous demand."

Information technology experts told The Wall Street Journal the Web site "appeared to be built on a sloppy software foundation."

Another article from WND published yesterday—I am not sure I like the title, "Pulling Out Hair' Over ObamaCare Web Site 'Nightmare.'" Sometimes people look okay with their hair out. Sometimes they don't.

The article says:

Forget, for a minute, all those arguments about the new health care law's "death panels," the forced cancellation of existing coverage, the violations of religious liberty, and the transformation of full-time jobs into part-time work. Even people who want to sign up for ObamaCare are finding it impos-

sible. Digital Trends reports the healthcare.gov Web site already has "shut down, crapped out, stalled, and misloaded so consistently that its track record for failure is challenged only by Congress." That is even though taxpayers paid "more than \$634 million" for "the digital equivalent of a rock," the report said.

The site itself, which apparently underwent major code renovations over the weekend, still rejects user logins, fails to load drop-down menus and other critical components for users that successfully gain entrance, and otherwise prevents uninsured Americans in the 36 States it serves from purchasing health care at competitive rates—healthcare.gov's primary purpose," the report said.

It goes on to talk about the massive nightmares of the people that are trying to sign on to it.

Here is an article from Peggy Noonan from The Wall Street Journal: "Now is the Time to Delay ObamaCare":

The Obama administration has an implementation problem. More than any administration of the modern era, they know how to talk but have trouble doing. They give speeches about ObamaCare, but when it is unveiled, what the public sees is a Potemkin village designed by the noted architect Rube Goldberg. They speak ringingly about the case for action in Syria but can't build support in the U.S. foreign policy community, in Congress, among the public. Recovery summer is always next summer. They have trouble implementing. Which, of course, is the most boring but crucial part of governing. It is not enough to talk; you must perform.

There is an odd sense with members of this administration that they think words are actions. Maybe that is why they tweet so much. Maybe they imagine Bashir Assad seeing their tweets and musing: "Ah, Samantha is upset—then I shall change my entire policy, in respect for her emotions!"

That gets us to the real story of last week, this week, and the future, the one beyond the shutdown, the one that normal people are both fully aware of and fully understand, and that is the utter and catastrophic debut of ObamaCare. Even for those who expected problems, and that would be everyone who follows government, it has been a shock.

They had 3.5 years to set it up! They knew exactly when it would be unveiled, on October 1, 2013. On that date, they knew millions could be expected to go online to see if they benefit.

And it goes on. It is an excellent article. She says:

A quick summary of what didn't work. Those who went on Federal and State exchanges reported malfunctions during login, constant error messages, inability to create new accounts, frozen screens, confusing instructions, endless wait times, help lines that put people on hold and then cut them off, lost passwords and user names.

After the administration floated the fiction that the problems were due to heavy usage, the Journal tracked down insurance and technology experts who said the real problems were inadequate coding and flaws in the architecture of the system.

... The founder of McAfee slammed the system's lack of security on Fox Business Network, calling it a hacker's happiest nocturnal fantasy. He predicted millions of identity thefts. Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius—grilled, surprisingly, on "The Daily Show"—sounded like—and that is unkind, but—she failed to justify why, in the middle of the chaos, individuals cannot be granted a 1-year delay, just as businesses have been.

More ominously, many of those who got into the system complained of sticker shock—high premiums, high deductibles.

She goes on to say, talking about Republicans:

They would make a mistake in dropping ObamaCare as an issue. A few weeks ago, they mistakenly demanded funding—a move to please their base. They will be tempted to abandon even the word "ObamaCare" now, but this is exactly when they should keep, as the center of their message and their intent, not defunding ObamaCare but delaying it. Do they really want to turn abrupt focus to elusive Medicare cuts just when it has become obvious to the American people that parts of ObamaCare (like the ability to enroll) are unworkable?

The Republicans should press harder than ever to delay ObamaCare—to kick it back, allow the administration to at least create a functioning Web site, and improve what can be improved.

There is an article from CNN from today about Utah's national parks will reopen despite ongoing government shutdown.

Utah will reopen its five national parks by Saturday, as well as three other nationally run locations. Utah's Governor Gary Herbert made the announcement Thursday, saying a deal had been reached with the U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Sally Jewell. "Utah agrees to pay the National Park Service up to \$1.67 million—\$166,572 per day—to reopen eight national sites in Utah for up to 10 days."

The sad thing is, they don't have to do that. We passed the bill to keep them all going. We did it at a rate, at an amount the Senate already agrees to. All they have got to do is pass it, send it to the President, and it will be taken care of.

I have an article here from the Mercatus Center, George Mason University. It is a research summary.

Before I mention that, I want to mention something about one of our Senators, a Senator from Arizona. Some people have tried to take things I said in an inappropriate way.

I know that Senator from Arizona. We owe him a great deal for what he endured on our behalf in North Vietnam. There is no question about it. And I know that Senator would never intentionally hurt this country. But he has made mistakes that have hurt it but certainly it was never intentional.

Let me mention this Mercatus Center, George Mason University research summary. It says, "The Debt-Limit Debate 2013: Addressing Key Myths." Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important the people understand that there are a lot of myths about the debt limit.

One myth is this:

Standard & Poor's U.S. credit rating downgrade in August of 2011 was caused by Washington's brinkmanship over increasing the debt limit. Congress must, therefore, avoid attaching spending cut demands to the current debt limit increase if they want to avoid jeopardizing the Nation's fragile economy.

The reality, it says, is:

Washington's failure to deal with unsustainable Federal spending mostly related to entitlement programs and debt caused the 2011 S&P downgrade and is spurring warnings of another downgrade by the credit rating agencies.

Of course this administration went after them through the judiciary system—after they got a bad rating, they got a downgrade. But they point out that in June of 2011 that:

S&P reported: "If the U.S. Government maintains its current policies, it is unlikely that S&P's ratings services would maintain its AAA rating on the U.S. Government. From the same report: "One contributing factor in our negative outlook decision is our view that there has, as yet, been no significant progress in addressing these long-term cost drivers nor any consensus developing among the Obama administration, the Senate, and House of Representatives regarding the specifics of a comprehensive plan to address the long-term budgetary challenges."

On July 14, 2011, S&P warned it would downgrade U.S. debt if "Congress and the administration have not achieved a credible solution to the rising U.S. Government debt burden and are not likely to achieve one in the foreseeable future."

So the downgrade was because we did not adequately address the massive debt that had been building up.

Another myth—and there are plenty more to back up their contention about that, just facts: "Had Congress and the administration failed to raise the debt limit by the Treasury's stated deadline in 2011, the Treasury would have been forced to default on the Nation's debt." Make it very clear. The reality, "had the 2011 agreement to increase the debt limit been postponed, the Treasury could have met Federal Government obligations, including Social Security benefits and interest on the debt until the end of the fiscal year, possibly longer."

And then it goes into the options that the Treasury Department had. Another myth: "If Washington agreed to significant spending reforms and cuts—and then actually followed through on them—it would cripple the recovery and devastate the economy." The reality is that "the most dangerous thing Washington can do is continue on its current course. The economic literature is clear: Chronic overspending and its result, chronic excessive debt, lead to economic harm. Washington must agree on meaningful spending reforms—and begin implementing these policies immediately to satisfy markets about the credibility of spending cuts."

"Myth number four: The real problem with the last debt limit deal was that it failed to apply a 'balanced approach' of spending cuts and tax increases." The reality is, "Replacing borrowing with higher taxes does not solve the fundamental problem: Federal spending—including Social Security, Medicaid, and especially Medicare—is unsustainable."

"Fiscal reform that focuses on large revenue increases and modest spending reductions is likely to inflict the most damage on the economy. A study of 21 countries looking at 37 years of data representing 107 episodes of fiscal reform, shows that reform efforts that focus on a package of both spending and revenue reductions—that is, tax decreases—"tend to be much more effective than those that have modest spending reductions but continue to increase revenue."

"Of more than 100 attempts to reduce the debt-to-GDP ratio in all developed countries over the past 30 years, some 20 percent succeeded. They had two common components: one, a focus on spending cuts; and two, policy reforms that increased competitiveness." And that is the truth.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

--- **HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mr. MULLIN (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

□ 1930

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S SHUTDOWN AND ITS IMPACTS ON OUR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL LABORATORIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order, the Federal Government's Shutdown and Its Impacts on our Department of Energy National Laboratories.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I also want to thank Science Committee Ranking Member JOHNSON for her support of national laboratory employees.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress knowing that in the policies I helped and worked to enact and the legislative agenda that I would work on that I could either help people or hurt people. And the decision for me was quite easy, Mr. Speaker: I came to Congress to help people. I came to Congress to think big.

I was very excited when I was told prior to being sworn in that I was going to be serving on the Science Committee. I was even more thrilled when I learned that I would have the opportunity to serve as the lead Democrat on the Energy Subcommittee, knowing that the Energy Subcommittee would have partial jurisdiction over two national laboratories which are in my congressional district in Livermore, California: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratory.

These two national laboratories, with about 6,500 employees at Livermore and 1,500 at Sandia, work every day to uphold our national security mission to maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile and also provide for energy security for citizens in the United States.

Prior to being elected to Congress, I had the opportunity multiple times as a city council member in Dublin to visit these national laboratories. And since being elected to Congress, I have had opportunities to visit the laboratories and also interact with their officials here in Washington.

What I have learned about these employees, these scientists, these engineers who work at our national laboratories is they care deeply about our country, but they also care very deeply about the science and the research that they work on every day and the laboratory environment that allows them to do that. So you can imagine how hard it is right now. We are in day 11 of a government shutdown, and laboratory employees were told about 2 days ago that, effective next week, they will be furloughed, too.

As you all know, Federal workers across our country from almost every agency have been furloughed or are working without pay. But at our national laboratories, which operate as GOCO facilities, which stands for government-owned/contractor-operated, these workers are not Federal workers but they are government contractors. They are scientists.

It is estimated that Livermore, California, has more Ph.D.'s per capita than any other city in the world because of the approximately 7,500 employees at our national laboratory. It was one of the hardest phone calls I have had to take since being sworn in to Congress when both laboratory directors called and said that in an hour they were going to tell their employees that they were going to be furloughed, and that they needed me to do anything I could in the Congress to help to get the government up and running and make sure the United States pays its bills so that their workers can continue to do the great things they are doing at our national laboratories.

This evening, I look forward to talking about what caused our shutdown, the truth behind what has caused the shutdown. I look forward to talking about the effect that the shutdown is having on people inside and outside of government—employees who are Federal workers, people who depend and rely on government services, people outside who work as government contractors—with a particular focus on what is happening at our national laboratories.

I also want to offer what I see as a way forward and a way that we can get out of this government shutdown, a way that we can get the Federal workforce working again, a way that we can make sure that our laboratory experts, our scientists, are able to go back to work and do great things to keep us safe and secure and move the ball forward on our energy policies.

I also want to tell all laboratory employees that today we submitted to Secretary Moniz, Members of Congress from the California delegation and Senator FEINSTEIN, a letter asking Secretary Moniz at the Department of Energy to allow our national laboratory employees—and there are about 30,000 of them across the country who have been furloughed—to be paid backpay for the time that they are furloughed.

I am honored to be joined on that letter by Bay Area House Members ZOE LOFGREN and also JERRY MCNERNEY, who will join me tonight. I am going to yield in a moment to both of those Members and allow them to talk about the national labs and the shutdown.

Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY, who has represented the Tri-Valley area prior to redistricting back in 2010, knows greatly about our national laboratories. He is a Ph.D. serving in the Congress. He has a Ph.D. in mathematics and is somebody who worked as a wind engineer and has worked at our national laboratories. He will talk about the effect on our national laboratories.

Another champion of our national laboratories is Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN, who also serves on the Science Committee with me. She is somebody who has been a champion for our national laboratories, and particularly Lawrence Livermore and Sandia. Although they are not in her congres-

sional district, I am grateful for her constant support on every issue, knowing that she and I share a vision and a goal that one day we will realize fusion ignition.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend and colleague Representative SWALWELL has pointed out, the government shutdown is causing serious damage to our country. The shutdown is putting Americans out of work and hurting the economy—not only the jobs of Federal employees, but the thousands of small businesses who provide goods and services to the government and to government employees who are not spending money that they no longer are getting in paychecks.

This harm is being felt across the country by millions of people. The closures impact thousands of important programs and services. We know parks are closed, stopping travel plans. We know that the Small Business Administration is not lending to the tune of a billion dollars a month. Federal business statistics are not being released, leaving us essentially flying blind when it comes to how the economy is doing. Army Corps of Engineers projects are halted. The Consumer Product Safety Commission is not reviewing products to keep us safe. The VA is not able to decide claims from veterans. We saw the horrifying news earlier this week that death benefits for members of our armed services and their families were impacted. Meals for seniors are not being served, and children are being thrown out of Head Start. These are real issues. The economy is being held hostage.

But what we want to talk about this evening is not just those impacts that have been so well covered in the press, but how our economy's future is being held hostage by this government shutdown and by a lack of funding for science.

We were very proud in the San Francisco Bay area that we had three Nobel laureates just this week—Stanford's Michael Levitt and Thomas Sudhof and UC Berkeley's Randy Schekman—for terrific success. They were funded not through the labs but through the National Institutes of Health.

However, it is worth noting that this government shutdown is resulting in the furlough of 13,000 researchers. It is blocking hundreds of projects. The amazing thing to me was that their partner, James Rothman of Yale, who shared in the Nobel Prize, because of budget cuts and sequester, the research that actually got him the Nobel Prize was cut. Because of the sequester, the funding was cut for the research that got him the Nobel Prize. So there is an issue here not just on the shutdown holding the economy hostage, but also the underlying poor funding.

But let's talk just a minute about the national labs. A lot of people don't

really know what the labs are. Those of us who are close to them do.

They were founded in 1943, and they were really meant to address the need to mobilize the Nation's scientific assets to support the war effort. Subsequent to that, they were utilized to bring the smartest people in the country together to focus on things that would keep us safe. As a matter of fact, they have helped keep us quite prosperous. Out of the lab have come things such as optical digital recording technology that is behind all music video and data storage, communications and observations satellites, advanced batteries now used in electric cars, supercomputers that as a society we would be lost without. So much from the national labs.

But one of the things that I think is enormously important and, unfortunately, has not received the kind of publicity it should have is the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

At 5:51 a.m. on September 29, there was a leap forward in the fusion experiment underway at that national lab. That Saturday shot was the latest in a series of carefully designed and incremental ignition experiments that have increased the yield. But here is the interesting thing. For the portion of the target, the 192 lasers that went into that target, there was more energy coming out than was put into the target. That has never happened before. So this is not the end of the quest to finish that science, but it is a major, major step forward. It is something that is actually threatened by this government shutdown.

I just received a copy of a notice that is going out to Lawrence Livermore tomorrow, and here is what it says, from the management at the lab to all the scientists:

This is to remind you that beginning today, October 11, the lab will begin shutting down normal operations. Only essential functions necessary to assure safety and security will be ongoing.

The lab is shutting down. The employees are furloughed, as we have just gotten the most important step forward on this most important experiment going on in the United States. How can that be possibly be good for the United States of America?

Of course, Lawrence Livermore is not the only national lab that is adversely impacted. Just up the road from my home in Santa Clara County, we have the Stanford Linear Accelerator Laboratory, with their fabulous Linac Coherent Light Source. It is the world's most powerful x ray laser. Its focused beam, which arrives in staccato bursts a few quadrillionths of a second long, is allowing researchers to probe complex ultrasmall structures and freeze atomic motions. They will be able to see what is going on at a molecular level in real-time.

What is happening at the Stanford lab? The same cutbacks that are afflicting the Lawrence Livermore lab.

Look at some of the things that are coming out of these fine science facilities, like the wonderful corkscrewing lasers that can be the key to unlimited bandwidth that was recently devised at the Stanford Linear Accelerator, and the national lab at Livermore that has developed a safe and versatile material known as DNA Tagged Reagents for Aerosol Experiments. It is going to be a critical tool for protecting the United States.

All of these things are at risk. And for what? For a stupid, foolish partisan fight.

We could change this this evening, tomorrow morning. All we need is to have a bill on the floor to vote to reopen this government and to allow these scientists to continue to move forward to change the world and to create a brilliant future for our economy and for our safety and security.

So I thank my colleague, Representative SWALWELL, who does such an excellent job of representing the two labs in his district, as well as all the other constituents who are so proud of him here in his service in the Congress and for standing up for them—not just for their jobs, but for America's future.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who has been a tireless advocate for our national laboratories and is a fighter on the Science Committee day in and day out as we wage these battles and try and think big and challenge our colleagues to do everything we can to move the ball forward so that we can reach that point where we have clean energy fusion, where we have a renewable source that is safe and reliable and does not require us to look across oceans and time zones to provide our country's energy.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California, my colleague, my former Congressman, my friend, who today is honoring Bow Tie Friday as well, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. I certainly want to thank my friend and colleague from Dublin, California, EROC SWALWELL, for bringing this topic up tonight. I want to thank my friend, ZOE LOFGREN from San Jose, for being an advocate and a champion of the labs long before I got here and carrying on that great tradition.

□ 1945

What I would like to do tonight is talk about my experience at the lab.

When I first got my Ph.D.—and I won't tell you how long ago it was—I started working for Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque. I will tell you that there were a lot of great things about that experience. My colleagues were Bill Sullivan and Don Lobitz. There was Paul Veers. They were tireless; they were very well educated; they worked hard; and they were very inspirational to me as a young Ph.D. Our boss, whose name was Dick Braasch, went out there and delivered

us the resources that we needed in order to carry out the research that was ahead of us.

In using that money and in using those tools and in using that resource, basically we developed wind energy technology from the very ground up. We were working on vertical access windmills, and we understood and worked very hard on the aerodynamics in order to understand exactly how to design blades to best maximize power and how to best maximize energy production from windmills so that wind turbines could be designed economically and make money. Now we see wind energy is a tremendous success. We see new windmills going up by the thousands—giant windmills that are 2.3, 4 megawatts. If you drive underneath them, they are just an incredible sight to see.

I just loved the experience, and I hope that we can continue to provide the resources for young scientists and young engineers who understand and who have the passion to go out there and make a difference and discover new technology and develop new energy sources and develop new health technology so that we can move forward.

The United States of America is truly the leader in this kind of technology. We lead in health care. We lead in health science. We lead in energy development. We lead in all kinds of sciences. Our universities are tremendous resources, but our laboratories are where the seasoned scientists go and produce real technology that can be transferred to the public sector.

Right now, if you look in Livermore, which is right outside of my district, there is a technology transfer operation. There is a cooperative organization between the laboratories—Sandia National Laboratories; the Livermore National Laboratory in the city of Livermore; in the city of Davis; Berkeley National Laboratory; Berkeley University; and so on. All of these institutions are working together with private companies to develop this technology and to transfer it into the private sector to give our businesses and our companies the edge they need to become successful and to create jobs and to lead our Nation.

One of the things they are doing in Livermore that is so exciting, which my colleague ZOE LOFGREN talked about, was the National Ignition Facility, the fusion facility there in Livermore. If you don't know about fusion, I will back up a little bit. "Fusion" is when you break apart a uranium or a plutonium atom to create energy. It is a source of what you call the atomic bomb nuclear power, but fusion is the other side of the scale at which you actually fuse nuclei together to form bigger nuclei, and even more energy is released. The prototype is the hydrogen bomb. What they are doing in Livermore is actually trying to understand how to contain fusion energy. There is an unlimited amount of fusion fuel out there. The ocean. It's heavy water. The

ocean contains heavy water. It contains tritium.

So it is a matter of understanding this basic force of nature and controlling this basic force of nature. As ZOE LOFGREN mentioned a few minutes ago, what happened in Livermore just this last month was that they were successful in creating more energy in the fusion reaction than was put into the energy. It was put in the reaction.

So we see progress being made month by month, year by year. I've been out there to that facility. I've met with these scientists. I've met with the leaders. I can tell you that they have the same exact environment of just encouraging young scientists to do their best to make a difference, to understand science. It is very exciting for me to see that, and I would love to see that operation, that type of research continue at our national laboratories.

Los Alamos Laboratory, in Albuquerque, is also another fine institution like Sandia National Laboratories, like Livermore National Laboratory, and like Argonne Laboratory. There are several across the Nation. They do basic research, and they do basic development. My understanding is that the United States, with the NIP facility, have about a 5-year lead over other countries—over China—which are desperately trying to catch up with us.

When we furlough those scientists, when we stop that process, we set back our scientists for not just the amount of time they are laid off, but we stop the infrastructure. When you develop the technology that they have developed, this is several years of lead time to get the mirrors, to get the amplifiers that they use for this equipment. When you tell your suppliers, Well, we are not going to be using you for the next few months, those suppliers go away.

It takes years to develop the new technology, the new infrastructure, for these scientists to be able to purchase these items that are right now available. As we furlough these scientists and shut down that program, those people are going to go away. Maybe they will find customers in China. I hope not. So this is very, very critical for our national energy security and for our national security to keep on top of that and to not let that lapse.

The labs do other very useful things, like nuclear arms reduction. Some of the nuclear inspectors are from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. We have chemical weapons inspectors. I would bet some of the inspectors who are getting ready to go to Syria right now are from these laboratories. I would bet a bottom dollar on that. If you are worried about cybersecurity, if you know the threats that we may face in our country with cybersecurity, then you are going to want to know what they do at the Livermore National Laboratory and at the Sandia National Laboratories. They have some of the top—I don't want to call them "hackers"—they have some of the top

folks who really understand how to get into computer systems and how to protect them and how to attack if they need to attack. We have some of the very best people in the world at these laboratories who are working on cybersecurity. We want to make sure that we continue to employ those folks and to get the best we can out of these folks who have so much passion on this subject.

Now, ZOE LOFGREN also mentioned the Stanford Linear Accelerator, SLAC. They have an x-ray laser. X-rays are incredibly hard to control, and designing an x-ray laser which makes laser beams which are monochromatic and coherent is an unbelievable achievement. The things that they are going to be able to do with that are beyond what we can imagine today. So keeping those types of operations in progress are absolutely essential.

We don't want to be laying these people off. We don't want to be giving them the message that their work is not essential. We don't want to be giving them the idea that, Well, maybe I would be better off in the private sector; maybe I would be better off making big dollars instead of working on things that are so important to our national security.

If you have watched in the last few months, I have been doing 1-minute presentations on science achievements in this country, science achievements that are funded by the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. We have seen things like the Boltzmann equation move forward, which explains how gases behave, how they expand and contract. We have seen how statistics are used in neuroscience, how differential equations are factored to get new insights into the behavior of nature. These are ideas that are funded through grants from the National Science Foundation and also from the National Institutes of Health. They fund things on cancer, on understanding epidemics in order to keep us safe. If you understand what is happening in the biological world, there is always a threat of a new virus.

These folks are understanding that. They are giving us the tools to protect ourselves, and I think it is absolutely essential that we restore funding to the pre-sequester levels for the National Science Foundation and for the National Institutes of Health.

We see our colleagues—well meaning, I know that—who want to reduce the size of government. They want to reduce funding for science for the National Science Foundation and for the National Institutes of Health, and they think there are no consequences. There are consequences. The consequences are going to be that we see less science in this country and that we see more science in other countries. So we need to work together to find a solution.

Yes, we are absolutely willing to negotiate. Just don't hold a gun to our heads. Don't hold us hostage. Don't

make this extortion. Come to us with reasonable ideas. We will sit down with you at any time, at any place, and if you want to demand that we eliminate the medical device tax, we will even be willing to talk about that but after we get the government functioning, after we pay our obligations. Then we can talk about things that we want, like funding for the National Science Foundation, like funding for the National Institutes of Health. Those are the things that we want to see. There are so many other things that have been reduced, like food stamps and the WIC program.

We want to make sure that our voices are heard and that the extortion sort of tactics that we have seen from the leadership and from the far right wing do not hold sway so that we can negotiate fairly, so that we can use the rule of law, so that we can use the traditions of this tremendous body—the House of Representatives—and the United States Senate within the standard practices of bringing bills to the committee, of negotiating, of adding amendments, and then of voting on them, and moving those forward to the Senate to agree and then to the President. That is the regular order. That is the order we want to use. That is the order that has been used in this country. If you decide that that isn't the way to do it, then we are going to fight you tooth and nail.

I want to thank my colleague again, ERIC SWALWELL. I see another colleague who represents Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque, which is where I used to work. I appreciate the true effort tonight.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you to the gentleman from California. His passion for our laboratories, for science really shows. I am so glad he talked about what the Democrats have already done as far as compromising. That is really important here because I had a town hall last weekend. I went home on the one day we didn't have votes, and I went to the City Hall Chamber in Dublin, California, the council chamber there.

A number of folks rightfully asked me, What are the Democrats willing to give up in these negotiations?

I think it is important for folks to know that the Democrats have already made concessions, that we have made very, very difficult concessions. The best way to describe those concessions is with that ugly, terrible word called "sequester," which has been across-the-board cuts, and they have hurt our national labs with these deep, deep cuts.

This chart here demonstrates it better than anything I have seen, which is that you have the President's budget, which is about \$1.2 trillion. Then you see the 2011 debt limit deal at \$1.6 trillion. You see PAUL RYAN's budget at \$967 billion. Then, across the Capitol, the Senate passed a budget at \$986 billion. To get a budget to keep the government running, you need what I call

the Holy Trinity. You need the Senate, the House, and the President to all agree on one number.

You have the President, who wanted something in the low trillions. You have the Senate that compromised at \$986 billion. The House has said that we will take \$986 billion, and the President has now agreed that he would take \$986 billion. The House has one very, very harsh exception. It will take \$986 billion, but it started with wanting to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The Democrats have compromised. This chart shows that we have made deep and hard concessions during this budget negotiation. The biggest one, as I mentioned, is this mindless, across-the-board cut called "sequester." Now, sequester is not targeted cuts. We are not going after bad programs. Rather, we are taking good programs, and we are taking bad programs, and we are seeing across-the-board cuts. It is indiscriminate.

At our laboratories, they have programs called LDRD, Laboratory Directed Research and Development. In the private sector, many companies allow their employees, especially in high-tech and innovation, about "20 percent time," is what they call it. Google calls it "20 percent time." So, for one day a week, effectively, an employee is allowed to work outside his assigned area—his subject matter, his expertise—on something that he thinks can move the ball forward in his industry. So "20 percent time," they call it. At the laboratories, they call this "LDRD." They are given about 8½ percent. So it is an over 50 percent less cut than what you are seeing in the private sector. It is 8½ percent that they are getting at our national laboratories. Because of these sequester cuts, that 8½ percent has been cut by more than half. Now they are below 4 percent for their LDRD, and the LDRD work at our national laboratories has produced some tremendous results in science.

□ 2000

I just want to go through some of them.

The gentleman from California talked about nonproliferation and what the research has done at the National Laboratories as far as reducing the stockpiles across the world.

Well, because of the LDRD work, what we have seen is that we are able to better test nuclear weapons and verify countries in the numbers they are claiming they have for nuclear weapons across the world because we have this LDRD research.

Also, we are able to provide cleaner energy vehicles because of LDRD research. The Volt, the Chevy Volt, for example. The Chevy Volt would not be able to cruise on battery power were it not for the advanced cathode technology that emerged from a National Laboratory.

Also, airport security. We are all so thankful and grateful that at the airport they are able to detect many of

the explosives that terrorists would seek to use to take down an airplane. LDRD we can thank for much of the research that has come out that makes our airports so much safer.

I was a prosecutor for 7 years. In so many cases, whether it was homicides or sexual assaults, we were able to put perpetrators away because of DNA research that was conducted at our National Laboratories. To DNA testing we can now add human antibody detection, a precise method of catching suspects and attaching them to crime scenes. This was something I was able to use in a courtroom to great effect. That science is so powerful when you have so many questions of who committed the crime that all jurors can accept the scientific research that has come out of LDRD and the DNA advances that we have seen there.

I want to yield now to a colleague of mine from New Mexico who represents the Albuquerque area and the other Sandia laboratory, our sister over there in New Mexico. I have Sandia and Livermore and the gentlelady from New Mexico has Sandia in New Mexico. I am going to yield to her and have her tell us about this shutdown and what effect it has had on our National Laboratories, particularly in her district.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Thank you very much to my friend and colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the hard work of the men and women at New Mexico's National Labs who protect our Nation's security and help grow our economy.

Sandia National Labs in my district is home to 9,000 of those dedicated public servants. These are the best and brightest physicists, chemists, mathematicians, engineers, and technicians. They have chosen to serve our country instead of taking more lucrative jobs in the private sector because they are passionate about the lab's mission.

Sandia is a national security asset that uses technology to find solutions to the most challenging problems that threaten our Nation. Their work supports numerous Federal, State, and local government agencies, companies, and organizations.

During the BP oil spill, Sandia employees were called in to help cap the well. The work they do is absolutely remarkable.

Since 1976, Sandia has received 101 coveted research and development 100 awards, often referred to as the "Oscars of invention" or the "Nobel prizes of technology."

While New Mexico's National Labs have been able to use carryover funds to stay open during the shutdown for the past 11 days, that money is quickly running out. Within the last week, employees at both Sandia and Los Alamos National Labs received letters informing them that they would face furloughs if the government doesn't reopen soon.

Despite the fact that they play a crucial role in our Nation's security, the

employees at New Mexico's National Labs are technically not Federal employees. As a result, the legislation we passed to provide back pay to furloughed Federal employees, which I was proud to support, unfortunately does not protect employees at these labs.

Earlier this week, Congressman LUJAN and I, along with Senators UDALL and HEINRICH, sent a letter to Energy Secretary Moniz requesting that he allow the labs to use their funding to back pay any employees furloughed because of the shutdown.

I remain hopeful that the furloughs can be avoided because I have heard stories about the damage that they can do, and I have seen firsthand the damaging and devastating effect that the other Federal furloughed employees and their families have suffered in Albuquerque, my district, and the entire State of New Mexico.

In fact, last Sunday in Albuquerque, I hosted a roundtable meeting with lab employees, furloughed Federal employees, and members of the business community. They told me that any missed or delayed paychecks would prevent them from paying their mortgage payments, household utility bills, car loan payments, and credit cards on time.

But they are not just worried about their pay; they are also worried about their careers. Lab employees who hold security clearances are in danger of losing their clearances if their credit scores are impacted because they cannot pay their bills.

After the meeting, I reached out to community partners to see if they would be able to help us in any way. Several credit unions, banks, utility providers, and other community partners reached out because they all want to help.

If nonprofits in the business community can step up, then it is time for Congress to step up too. We need to do our job, we need to pass a funding bill to keep New Mexico's National Labs open. National Labs should not be forced to operate under the threat of shutting down just because a few dozen reckless Tea Party Republicans decided that destroying the Affordable Care Act was more important than keeping the government open.

New Mexico's National Labs deserve and require the certainty and stability of a full funding bill and so does the rest of the country. We need to vote on the Senate passed clean funding compromise right now.

I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership in protecting our national security interests and the labs in my home State.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentlelady from New Mexico. I am glad she brought up the examples of the toll that this shutdown is taking on our National Laboratory employees.

We are hearing back at Livermore, at Sandia, and at Lawrence Livermore so many examples like what the gentlelady mentioned with security clear-

ances. You wouldn't think about it. But when thousands of employees have security clearances that depend on them continuing to have financial stability, that stability is threatened when our National Laboratories furlough them and they are unable to meet their debts and obligations and pay their bills and keep their families running.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) also talked about the effects of furloughing these scientists. When you furlough scientists, you also furlough scientific progress.

I mentioned the town hall that I had last weekend in Dublin, California. Lab employees from Sandia and Lawrence Livermore showed up for that town hall. I am going to fly home this Sunday, and we are going to host another town hall at Lawrence Livermore and Sandia. It is going to be at 1:30 on Sunday. We have alerted laboratories to that town hall, and I look forward to talking to them. I hope to have a more positive update than what I can provide today. I hope that I can tell them that the shutdown will not continue; that they will be able to continue their work at our great National Laboratories.

Now, I talked a little bit about how we got here. That we had a budget from the President and the Senate at \$986 billion, but the House's budget wouldn't accept only \$986 billion; it wanted to repeal and defund the Affordable Care Act.

The reason I am so hopeful that we hold firm in the Senate, and that the President continues to hold firm and insist that we pass what is called a clean budget at \$986 billion, is because of the dangerous, dangerous precedent it would set should we allow either side to try and seek concessions or seek a ransom for simply doing their job of providing a budget.

Our job being here in Congress and working under article I of the Constitution requires us to pass a budget that funds the government to pay the debts and obligations of the United States.

It would be a dangerous precedent if we had an environment where every 45 days, 60 days, or if we ever got back to passing a budget on an annual basis, that one side in one Chamber attempted to use that budgeting process to revisit and try and resettle scores that have already been settled.

That is so obviously occurring here with the Affordable Care Act. This is a provision that was initially brought up and contemplated in the 2008 campaign for the Presidency, where one person, one candidate, said that if he was elected he would seek to bring our country for the first time in over 100 years since it was first proposed affordable health care for all. That person was overwhelmingly elected to the Presidency—Barack Obama.

In 2010, the Congress, the 111th Congress, passed the Affordable Care Act. It was signed into law by the same President who campaigned on it.

In 2012, the chief justice of the Supreme Court, who was appointed by a Republican President who served before President Barack Obama, wrote a majority opinion that said that that law, the Affordable Care Act, was constitutional.

That same President who ran on the Affordable Care Act in 2008, who signed into law congressional action in 2010, who saw it upheld in 2012 by a Republican-appointed Supreme Court chief justice, ran for reelection, and again was overwhelmingly elected.

The Affordable Care Act will do many great things to provide affordable, quality health care to many Americans. But like every government program, it will not be 100 percent perfect. It too will require fixes and updates.

Just recently, Social Security celebrated a birthday. It is in its late 70s now. Social Security is not the same program that it was over 70 years ago. It has gone through different modifications and changes through the years. Just as the Affordable Care Act, we owe it to the American people to look at it as it is implemented, to look how it is helping people, to look at where glitches are and what we can do to make it work.

We must mend any problems with the Affordable Care Act, but not end it. We must not use the Affordable Care Act as a way to hold up a budget that provides so many jobs for the Federal workforce, so many services that come from the greatest government that presides over the greatest democracy in the world, so many services being held up for so many people across our country.

It would be a dangerous, dangerous precedent if we allowed either side to do this. Let me just offer an example: if we were to make concessions on this budgeting process—say at the very best buy us a 45-day continuing resolution where the government would be funded for another 45 days—what would the other side ask for next? Would it ask for us to privatize Social Security, something they attempted to do in 2006 but weren't able to do? Would they ask us to turn Medicare into a voucher system, something that they are not able to achieve because of a majority in the Senate and a Democratic President who has vowed not to let that happen?

But also think and reverse the situation: imagine if you had a Republican in the White House, a Republican-controlled Senate and a Democratic majority in the House. Imagine if that Democratic majority tried to use the budgeting process to achieve what it couldn't achieve at the ballot box. You can imagine the different scenarios where we can try and do this—whether it is passing background checks, something that has frustrated so many House Democrats that we couldn't get that passed in the Senate; whether it is passing an assault weapons ban, something that so many House Democrats would like to see renewed, as we had

back in the '90s. It could be comprehensive immigration reform, something that our country is calling for. People are coming to our capital asking to have a roadmap to citizenship in reforms and work visas. We can't do that legislatively right now. But imagine if Democrats had a majority here and a Republican in the White House, and they said: No budget; we are shutting down the government until we get what we want because we couldn't do it at the ballot box.

We have never operated that way, and I hope we do not continue to operate that way, and that more reasonable minds come forward and allow us to put our National Laboratory employees back to work, allow us to put our Federal workforce back to work.

This shutdown is affecting and hurting real people. I mentioned in the beginning of this hour that I came to Congress to help people, but right now it is hurting innocent Americans.

Even though the Federal Government is closed, essential services must continue so hundreds of thousands of Federal employees are being forced to work but with no paycheck. How can we treat such dedicated public servants this way?

We saw just last week as an erratic driver tried to drive through the barricade on Capitol Hill that our brave men and women of the Capitol Hill police force rushed to protect the doors of democracy. And what thanks did we give them in return? We told them to keep working, keep protecting this House, but we are going to hold your paycheck.

Many more aren't even allowed to work in the Federal Government, denied the chance to do the jobs they love, serving on behalf of the American people, and they are left worrying if they will ever get paid or if they are going to be lost.

□ 2015

The loss also ripples throughout our economy, affecting businesses throughout the country. It is estimated that this shutdown is costing the economy \$300 million a day. And so you can see, people are asking across the country: Will I get paid this month? Will there be enough money for food? Can I pay my mortgage this month? I am a first time home buyer; some of those FHA loans look very good for me, but they are delayed, they are on hold. Will I be able to pay my child's college tuition? All of the questions that folks in our Federal workforces, folks who are working at our national laboratories are asking.

Small businesses can't get SBA loans. Small business centers which help women and veterans are closed. Our national parks are closed. Technology updates for all of our Federal programs are being delayed. And mentioned earlier, our cybersecurity centers, employees there are going to be furloughed, the cybersecurity centers that work to protect our Nation's net-

works, that work to ensure that nation-states and individuals who wish to do us harm aren't able to do so.

I would like to now yield to the greatest champion in this House to end and reduce the effect of poverty on our community and somebody who has the honor of representing Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, which has over 4,000 employees. I have visited that facility, and they are doing such great work to advance the progress of science.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but also for your tremendous leadership on this issue and on so many other issues. It is a pleasure to serve with you. You have really hit the ground running as a new Member of this great body. I also want to thank you for your work on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. As a fellow member of the Bay Area congressional delegation, you have made such an impact and your work is so important for our entire California delegation, so thank you.

My district is California's 13th Congressional District, right next door to your congressional district. As you said, it is home to Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Let me just say first how proud I am to represent one of the most esteemed centers for scientific research and technological advancement in the world. I have had many, many opportunities to visit the lab where I have met some of the most brilliant scientific minds on our planet. The employees, the scientists, all of those who work at the lab are phenomenal individuals, and it is just amazing to see how the scientists and engineers especially use our Federal investments in our national laboratory system to make unbelievable leaps in every field, from nanotechnology and supercomputing to energy efficiency and astrophysics.

The history of the lab is unbelievable. It was established in 1931 by Nobel Prize-winning physicist Ernest Orlando Lawrence. The lab has been associated with 13 Nobel Prizes. Fifty-seven of the lab's scientists are members of the National Academy of Sciences. Thirteen have won the National Medal of Science, our Nation's highest award for lifetime achievement in the field of science.

Over the years, Berkeley Lab scientists have discovered 16 elements; made the world's smallest motor, 100,000 times smaller than a human hair; used ultraviolet technology to bring safe drinking water to thousands across the world; and helped decipher the human genome.

I could go on and on, but we are not here today to laud the accomplishments of the national labs in our district, but I think it is very important to do that even in this very difficult environment.

We are here because these institutions of innovation are under a real

and immediate threat, thanks to the Republican shutdown of our government. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory employs over 4,200 scientists, support staff, and students in my congressional district. Its economic impact is even greater, creating 5,600 local jobs and 12,000 jobs nationally, with a total economic impact estimated at \$1.6 billion a year.

If this shutdown continues, the Berkeley Lab will be forced to furlough its employees in waves beginning in late October. Not only does the shutdown threaten the livelihood of my constituents, the scientists, the administrators, and the support staff that keep the lab running, it also threatens to stall projects that could be the next scientific breakthrough that changes how our world works or produces the next Nobel Peace Prize winner. So this is really an absurd price to pay for the Republican insistence on keeping people from receiving affordable, quality health care. That is where all of this started.

For the life of me, I don't understand why my Republican Tea Party colleagues are continuing these cynical ploys that threaten our Nation's competitiveness and force our Nation's most brilliant minds out of their labs. We need to end this shutdown. We need to fund the entire energy and water bill, which provides funding for our national laboratories through the Department of Energy's Office of Science. We need an up-or-down vote on a clean budget bill to reopen this government.

Democrats have already—and I know you have heard this over and over again, Mr. SWALWELL, because you know we have already accepted a short-term budget bill to reopen our government even though we don't believe its funding level is nearly adequate.

The American people deserve a functioning government, and they deserve affordable, quality health care. They deserve both. I hope more people are listening and more people understand that we know how to open the government. We know how to begin to negotiate on a real budget that makes our entire government, including our national laboratories, whole.

And so hopefully this alarm that we are sounding tonight, Mr. SWALWELL, will continue to wake up the country and continue to ensure that people know that we have their backs and that we know how to open this government and we want to shut down this shutdown immediately. Thank you again for your leadership.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentlelady from California. She is absolutely correct. Democrats have compromised. We have accepted a \$986 billion sequester budget, which the gentlelady and I do not accept. When you cut those programs, we are cutting the opportunities to lift people out of poverty. I agree with the gentlelady, we have made deep, deep concessions when it comes to a budget. We are

ready to open up the government and turn the lights back on, but we are doing so at a painful price with the budget we are accepting.

With that, I will close. I want to say to what my colleague from Berkeley and Oakland was saying: Keep our national labs open. Keep those great scientists at Lawrence Livermore, Sandia, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, keep them on the job, moving the job forward on science.

It was alluded to earlier that the National Ignition Facility in Livermore, as the government that funds it was unraveling 2 weeks ago, at the National Ignition Facility in Livermore, they achieved something they had been attempting to achieve for the past 3-4 years. That is fusion. For the first time, they have been able to get more energy out than what they have put in. This is a remarkable achievement. They have achieved fusion, and they are knocking on the door of ignition at the National Ignition Facility. They are closer than they have ever been. They are closer now to meeting the 84th milestone. They have 84 milestones they have to meet. They have met 83 of them. They are so close to providing this renewable energy resource which will change the game on how every person in the world receives their energy, no longer requiring us to be dependent on foreign sources of energy if we can achieve this and then transfer this technology to the private market.

The data achieved at NIF is critical for understanding nuclear fusion, which we need for keeping a reliable stockpile of nuclear weapons. So this is a critical energy issue and a critical defense issue. Understanding fusion, as I mentioned, allows us to get closer to the goal of civilian fusion energy. And nuclear fusion energy, unlike what we currently use, nuclear fission essentially would produce no waste or carbon emissions. It is the "holy grail" of clean energy, and I want to make sure that the scientists at Lawrence Livermore are able to accomplish it.

Sandia also has a facility called the Combustion Research Facility. This is a partnership, a public-private partnership with our automakers and those who are making automobiles in Detroit. What they are trying to do is make the American automobile engine more efficient at the Combustion Research Facility. There are important, remarkable achievements going on at our national laboratories.

With the furlough at our laboratory, all of their exceptional work will be put on hold. So what does that mean in relation to the National Ignition Facility and the Combustion Research Facility? It means that work will stop that is being done to maintain our nuclear stockpile; the great fusion energy project I mentioned; efforts to understand climate change will stop; all while we stand still, other countries like Russia and China will zoom past us in science, math, and renewable energy.

And this isn't just what happens today. If these highly skilled, highly intelligent employees are prevented from working, they will go somewhere else. These people are Ph.D.'s. They will find somewhere else to go.

At the beginning of the hour, I said I would not only tell us how we got here, what it means, I would also offer a way forward. The way forward, as I see it, is for the Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, to allow this House to have an up-or-down vote on passing the same budget that the Senate has agreed to, the same budget that the President of the United States said he would sign. We know the votes are there. Twenty-five to 30 Republicans have said they would pass that vote.

So let's get the government back to work. Let's end the partisanship games, the obsession with defunding the Affordable Care Act, and let's get the government back to work. In the meantime, a short-term solution I have offered is that Secretary Moniz allow furloughed employees at all of our national laboratories, at all 17 sites, all 30,000 employees, to receive back furlough pay.

I have also worked since January with a small group of freshmen, about 30 of us, Republicans and Democrats evenly divided. It is called the United Solutions Caucus. We have been meeting almost every week since sworn into office, pledging that we will work together and build the foundation of a bipartisan relationship. In these trying times and dark days over the last 2 weeks, we have met nearly every other day, talking about what we can do to work together to turn back on the lights of the government for the greatest democracy of the world. This group gives me hope.

Just yesterday, the group met with two senior members, a Republican and a Democrat, from the Appropriations Committee. Nobody in that group and neither of those senior members want to see the government continue to be shut down, so I am hopeful that we can continue to talk. I am hopeful that this group can continue to work together, the United Solutions Caucus, to provide a way forward, a way that ensures that the Federal workforce is back to work; and for my district, ensures that those hardworking scientists who want to think big, just like I did, the same reason I came to Congress, that want to move the ball forward on our nuclear and energy security, that they can go back to work and they aren't ever furloughed.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side: Did you come here to help people or did you come here to hurt people? I think you came here for the same reason I did, to help people, and so I hope you will prove it to the American people. Allow an up-or-down vote; allow us to pass a clean resolution; and together, all of us, Republicans and Democrats, can help the American people.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy's National Laboratories are vital to our national security, our economy, and our environment. They have often been called "crown jewels" of our federal research and development infrastructure, and for good reason. This is why I am extremely concerned about the impacts of this senseless government shutdown on these important facilities—and this is on top of the harmful cuts that they have already had to endure under budget sequestration.

It is worth reminding my colleagues here today that we have seen how our past investments in the national laboratories have paid off when it comes to energy development. DOE labs were key to the development of high-efficiency gas turbines for coal plants, nuclear reactors, and the directional drilling and hydraulic fracturing practices that have led to the shale gas boom of today.

I think it is also important to note that DOE's Office of Science—which oversees most of these national laboratories—is actually the largest supporter of basic research in the physical sciences in the nation, and it operates more than 30 national scientific user facilities whose applications go well beyond energy innovation. Our nation's top researchers from industry, academia, and other federal agencies use these facilities to examine everything from new materials that will better meet our military's needs, to new pharmaceuticals that will better treat disease, to even examining the fundamental building blocks of the universe. I believe that this stewardship of unique scientific research, including the nation's major national user facilities, is another very important role that the Department plays in bolstering our national competitiveness today and in building the industries of the future.

It's no secret that Congress's inability to date to come to an agreement on a sensible budget plan has led to some devastating cuts to many of these important facilities, with serious impacts to our nation in both the short-term and the long-term. Until we resolve the current crisis, even more of our nation's best and brightest will be forced out of work and some of their most critical research tools—for which the U.S. taxpayers contributed hundreds of millions of dollars to build—will have to cease operations. I believe that we are doing damage to the seed corn of our future, and as the Ranking Member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I believe that ending this shutdown and reversing these drastic cuts need to be our highest priorities going forward.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and October 12 on account of family obligations.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 11:30 a.m. and for October 12 on account of a family medical emergency.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1276. An act to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 91. Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 12, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3277. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the Department's intention to expand the assignment of female Field Artillery Officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3278. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3279. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3280. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Endangered Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for the Neosho Mucket and Threatened Status for the Rabbitsfoot [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0031] (RIN: 1018-AX73) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3281. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Listing, Endangered Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the Florida Bonneted Bat [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0078] (RIN: 1018-AY15) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3282. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Threatened Status for the Streaked Horned Lark [Docket

No.: FWS-R1-ES-2012-0080; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AY18) received September 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3283. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Dispute Resolution Pilot Program for Public Assistance Appeals [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0015] (RIN: 1660-AA79) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3284. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0671; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-124-AD; Amendment 39-17547; AD 2013-16-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3285. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on four Agency's Drug-Free Workplace Plans, pursuant to Public Law 100-71, section 503(a)(1)(A) (101 Stat. 468); jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 380. Resolution relating to consideration of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance (Rept. 113-244). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3285. A bill to make technical corrections to the Pay Our Military Act to include midshipmen at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, who are appointed as midshipmen in the Navy Reserve; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COOK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. LAM-BORN):

H.R. 3286. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse States that use State funds to operate National Parks during the Federal Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. McNERNEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 3287. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide veterans service organizations with the same access to Department of Veterans Affairs facilities during the Government shutdown as such organizations had immediately prior to the shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 3288. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to exempt expenditures or obligations of funds derived from user fees from certain limitations under the Antideficiency Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3289. A bill to provide funds during the lapse of appropriations for the payment of military death gratuities and funeral and related transportation and housing expenses through the transfer of unobligated amounts in the Health Insurance Reform Implementation Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINGSTON (for himself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 3290. A bill to provide that all Federal employees shall be deemed to be employees excepted from furlough for purposes of the Government shutdown commencing on or about October 1, 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WATT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that financial institutions should work proactively with their customers affected by the shutdown of the Federal Government who may be facing short-term financial hardship and long-term damage to their creditworthiness through no fault of their own; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H. Res. 378. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the

Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H. Res. 379. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance; to the Committee on Agriculture; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 381. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Latino AIDS Awareness Day" on October 15, 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 3285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 3286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 3287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 3288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18). Further,

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of article I: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law"

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States"

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 22: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 383: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 460: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 541: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 647: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 669: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 679: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 713: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 724: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 961: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1078: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1094: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1146: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1150: Mr. CONYERS and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1281: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1317: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1318: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1354: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1355: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1501: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1518: Mr. GERLACH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HALL, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 1563: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1645: Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1732: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1775: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1812: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1821: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1827: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1905: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1918: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1998: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2000: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2101: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2213: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2241: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 2286: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2305: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2350: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2502: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2509: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2540: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2578: Mr. WELCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2585: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2591: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2697: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2717: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2734: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2772: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2785: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2807: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2810: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2839: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2866: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2925: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2932: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LONG, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. McKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VELA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2939: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 2967: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 2988: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2997: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 3002: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3043: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3077: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 3090: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3097: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3103: Mr. COHEN and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3111: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. BENISHEK and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3121: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 3128: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3189: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3211: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3218: Mr. RADEL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 3276: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 3279: Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 3284: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WELCH and Mr. BECERRA.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BARBER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr.

HONDA, Ms. CHU, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 254: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 375: Mr. CONYERS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

54. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Global Union of Scientists for Peace, Iowa, relative to a letter regarding the prospect of ending the violence in Syria through a scientifically proven approach; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.